DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 663 EA 006 500

AUTHOR	Oliver, Gordon
TITLE	School Graduation Requirements in Oregon. A Discussion of the Events Surrounding the 1972 Change in Requirements.
INSTITUTION	Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.
SPONS AGENCY	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo. Resources Development Internship Program.
PUB DATE	Sep 74
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance; Career Education; Curriculum Development; *Educational Accountability; Educational History; *Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; *Graduation Requirements; *Performance Based Education; Performance Contracts; Pilot Projects; School District Autonomy; *Secondary Education; State Legislation; Student Centered Curriculum; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	Oregon; *Survival Competencies

ABSTRACT

The Oregon school graduation requirements, the trends and events that led to their development, and the implementation program that followed their adoption are the subjects of this report. The requirements, adopted in September 1972, call for districts to establish minimum "survival level" competencies that each student must meet in addition to completing modified requirements in designated course and attendance areas. A number of educational trends contributed to the development of the requirements; many of these emerged in meeting and studies that preceded adoption of the requirements. The major implementation actions of the State Department of Education and of several of the State's school districts are reviewed. Arguments for and against accountability in education and competency-based educational programs are also discussed, accompanied by suggested options for future research into the effectiveness of the State's competency-based education. The implementation program of the Albany Union High School District and its relation to actions by the Department of Education are reviewed in an appendix to the main report. (Author/MLF)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School Graduation Requirements in Oregon

ED 099563

by Gordon Oliver

Oregon Department of Education

EA 006 500

Resources Development Internship Program
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Urban Studies Center,
Portland State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report has been cataloged by the WICHE Library as follows:

Oliver, Gordon
School graduation requirements in Oregon; a discussion of the events surrounding the 1972 change in requirements. Boulder, Colo., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1974.
91p.

1. Education, Secondary - Oregon. I. Title. II. Oregon. Dept. of Education. III. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Resources Development Internship Program.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the WICHE Commissioners or WICHE staff.

The Resources Development Internship Program has been financed during 1974 by grants from the Economic Development Administration, Education Division, HEW; Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation and by more than one hundred and fifty community agencies throughout the West.

WICHE is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Printed on recycled paper

ED 098663

SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS IN OREGON

A DISCUSSION OF THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 1972 CHANGE IN REQUIREMENTS

BY:

GORDON OLIVER
WICHE INTERN
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SEPTEMBER, 1974

Project Advisory Committee:

Bus Nance
Milt Baum
Monty Multanen
Jack Allen
Bob Clemmer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

I. Introduction..... 1

- Accountability in Education
- Competency-Based Education
- Purpose of This Report

II. The Development of Secondary Schools In Oregon..... 5

- Oregon Laws Pertaining to Secondary Schools
- The Carnegie Unit

III. Events Preceding the Development of New Graduation Requirements... 13

- Curriculum Innovations Throughout the State
- Needs Assessment Study
- Oregon Association of Secondary Principals Study
- Town Hall Meetings
- Legislative Action
- Dr. Parnell's Personal Commitment

IV. The Development of Graduation Requirement Proposals..... 24

- Draft Proposals Developed
- Differences Between The First and Final Drafts

V. A Review of the School Graduation Requirements..... 29

- Attendance
- Units of Credit
- Minimum Survival Level Competencies
- Planned Course Statements

VI. Implementation of the Graduation Requirements..... 40

- Graduation Requirements Steering Committee
- Pilot Projects Chosen
- Pilot Project Guidelines Completed
- Graduation Requirements Movie
- One-Day Workshops
- Guidance and Counseling Workshops
- Small Schools Workshops

Planned Course Statement/Record Keeping Guidelines
1974 Graduation Requirements Task Force
Graduation Requirements Measurement Workshops
Small Schools Summer Institute
In-House Workshops
Television Shows
Shortcomings of the Implementation Program

VII. Response to Graduation Requirements by School Districts..... 54

Sheridan School District
Cascade Union High School
Eugene District 4J
Jackson County

VIII. The Future For Oregon Education..... 58

Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education
Minimum Standards for Oregon Schools
Community-School Goal-Setting Program

IX. District and SDE Needs Under the New Educational Requirements..... 65

Administrators' Skills
Continuous Review Process

X. The Move Toward Accountability in Education..... 67

Performance Contracting
Pros and Cons of Accountability
Advantages of Educational Accountability
Disadvantages of Educational Accountability
Assessment of the Oregon Program of Education

Conclusions..... 76

Acknowledgments..... 78

Bibliography..... 79

Appendices..... 82

ABSTRACT

The Oregon school graduation requirements, the trends and events which led to their development, and the implementation program which followed their adoption are the subjects of this report.

The requirements, adopted in September 1972, call for districts to establish minimum "survival level" competencies which each student must meet in addition to completing modified requirements in designated course and attendance areas.

A number of educational trends contributed to the development of the requirements; many of these emerged in meetings and studies which preceded adoption of the requirements.

The development of graduation requirements was followed by implementation activities, and the major actions of the State Department of Education and several of the state's school districts are reviewed.

Arguments for and against accountability in education and competency-based educational programs are also discussed, accompanied by suggested options for future research into the effectiveness of the state's competency-based education.

The implementation program of the Albany Union High School District and its relation to actions by the Department of Education are reviewed in an Appendix to the main report.

I. INTRODUCTION

Students who enter ninth grade in September 1974 will be the first to be educated under Oregon's new minimum requirements for high school graduation. Compared to the previous requirements, the new standards reflect sweeping changes.

The traditional features -- passing grades in required courses and regular attendance for a specified number of years -- have been retained, but not without some major modifications. Course requirements have been expanded and changed so that the high school curriculum is no longer oriented exclusively to the college-bound student. The attendance requirement has been rewritten so that the high school diploma will represent 12 years of schooling, instead of only the last four years.

Added to these and other changes in the traditional portions of the graduation requirements, is a new aspect: students now will learn "minimum survival level competencies," or skills they will need after graduation to survive in the everyday world.

Nearly all of these survival level competencies are basic, and many students will have little difficulty in meeting them. In fact, most of these minimum survival competencies have probably been developed by students in the past without benefit of special attention being given to them in the school curriculum, and under the new requirements only a small portion of the curriculum will be devoted to survival level competencies.

However, with the new requirements, the school will be held accountable for seeing that each and every graduate has the skills it deems necessary for his survival beyond high school

Accountability has been incorporated into the new requirements in other ways as well. School districts must now prepare a "planned course statement" for each course taught in grades 9-12 for which credit is given. These statements must list the goals of the course and general course content, as well as what the student should achieve as outcomes of the course in terms of skills, knowledge, and values.

There are many modifications, both mandatory and optional, in all areas of the new graduation requirements. The regulations, which were adopted by the Oregon State Board of Education in September 1972, will ultimately affect education at all levels from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. With the new requirements, the State of Oregon joins numerous school districts throughout the country which have officially incorporated accountability into their educational systems.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION. Accountability has been a common word in the vocabulary of educators for less than a decade. 1970 was the first year "Accountability" was listed in the Educational Index of periodical publications, and the number of articles on the subject has grown steadily ever since. A variety of definitions of accountability have been developed, including this one by Robert Stake, a leading evaluation specialist:

> *Accountability, in the strict sense, means to have good records and to make actions open to view. Strictly speaking, an accountable school is one that (1) discloses its activities, (2) makes good on staff promises, (3) assigns staff responsibility for each area of public concern, (4) monitors its teaching and learning. Some spokesmen extend the definition of an accountable school to (5) one that gathers evidence of making good on public expectations, (6) one that through research discovers the causes of its strengths and weaknesses, and (7) one that provides cost-effectiveness information on alternative programs. The extended definition is one that a school can strive to live by but one that -- because of our inability to measure such things -- no school can presently fulfill. The lesser definition is a realistic obligation. (Evaluation Comment, 1973)*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION. An integral part of the accountability movement is the concept of "competency-based education," a concept which is gaining strength throughout the nation. A study conducted in 1973 revealed that 17 states were at that time considering providing legislative or administrative support to the development of competency-based education. (Schmeider, 1973). A later survey found that competency requirements were being considered as a part of the high school graduation requirements in six states, but that Oregon was the only state which currently had developed a statewide requirement for competency testing (Bierly, 1974).

A doctoral thesis written by a University of Oregon student after Oregon's Board of Education had approved the state's new graduation requirements defined competency-based education this way: (It is) a cyclical process in which

A/ Competencies are identified and specified for a particular field of endeavor, then

B/ Demonstrable criteria are established for each competency, along with specific levels which will be accepted as indicators that the competency has been mastered, then

C/ Evaluation is made with each individual student of each competency to determine whether the student has mastered the specified competencies, then

D/ Appropriate learning experiences are structured to enable the student to develop a mastery of these competencies in which the evaluation showed him lacking in mastery, and

E/ Another evaluation is made subsequent to the learning experience to determine mastery of the competencies not previously mastered. (Bierly, 1974)

A simpler definition has been developed by Harold Mason, Chairman of the Department of Education at the Oregon College of Education, which states:

> *A definition of competency based education is when you cut away from all of the jargon, it seems that developing a program of competency-based education is based on answering the following questions --*

What are you trying to do?
How are you trying to do it?
How do you know when you have done it?
Where are we trying to go and what means are we using to get there?
How will we know when we have arrived?

Although neither of these definitions, nor the one of accountability, were used in the development of the graduation requirements in Oregon, they are representative of the thinking behind the requirements.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT. The purpose of this report is to review the events which led to the change in statewide graduation requirements, the efforts that went into meeting the requirements by local school districts and the Department of Education, and the possible effects of the requirements and other decisions by the State Board of Education on the state's educational system and its students. Because the graduation requirements contain many concepts unfamiliar to most members of the general public, they will be looked at in detail later in this paper.

This information will be made available to the staff at the Department of Education, to the general public, and to the many educators throughout the country who have expressed an interest in the Oregon graduation requirements. Since much of the information included in this report has been collected from memoranda and a variety of other correspondence, timing has been crucial. A considerable portion of this information most likely would have been lost had there been a substantial delay in this project.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OREGON

The development of primary schools closely followed the settlement of the state in the 19th century, and Oregon's first public elementary school opened in 1832 at French Prairie. The idea of schooling beyond the eighth grade initially met with public resistance or indifference, however, and high schools did not become commonplace until many years later. By 1900 there were only four high schools in the state. (State Department of Education, 1960)

Soon after the turn of the century high schools achieved rapid growth, in Oregon and throughout the nation. By 1909 there were 115 schools teaching above the eighth grade level in the state. (Works Progress Administration, 1938) The rapid growth continued into the 1920's.

Among the reasons for the spurt of growth were a ban on child labor by courts in many states, and by the United States Supreme Court in 1916; compulsory attendance laws in most states[1]; national legislation that encouraged vocational education and broad-based education generally; and the Seven Cardinal Principles of Education, developed by the National Commission on the Reorganization of Education in 1918. (Worrell, 1972)

The Seven Cardinal Principles have been important in the development of American education because they established the concept of education to develop the "whole child." At the high school level, the principles helped instill in people the notion that the school could be a socialization tool. The goals included were

---

1 *Oregon's first compulsory education law went into effect in 1889, and required simply that all children between the ages of 8 and 14 attend school at least 12 weeks per year. In actuality, the law did not go into effect until much later, and further legislation broadened the requirements.*

(1) health, (2) command of the fundamental processes, (3) worthy homemembership, (4) vocation, (5) citizenship, (6) worthy use of leisure time, and (7) ethical character. (National Education, 1918) Most of these goals have remained intact over the years; they are reflected in the state's graduation requirements, and in the United States' and Oregon's current goals for education.

OREGON LAWS PERTAINING TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS. In 1872, all of the laws pertaining to schools in Oregon were compiled into one booklet; in the same year the duties of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction were removed from the Governor's office and a Board of Education was formed, composed of the Governor, Secretary of State, and Superintendent of Public Instruction. (Oregon Board of Education, 1931-32) The listing of "Oregon School Laws" was continually updated so that it contained all of the laws currently in effect.

Probably the first law to regulate the course of study in elementary schools was dated October 18, 1878. The law specified that the Superintendent of Public Instruction would distribute to county superintendents a list of studies to be required in the public schools. The county superintendents, in turn, would choose which textbook they preferred from a list made available to them by the Board of Education, and any textbook or series of textbooks receiving a majority of the vote from the county superintendents would automatically be the required text for the next four years. If a tie vote took place, the state superintendent would choose the textbook to be used. (Oregon School Laws, 1885)

Although a recommended course of study for high schools was prepared by the Department of Education in 1897, the first law pertaining to the high school course of study was developed in 1901. The 1901 requirement read:

The course of study for high schools in the state shall embrace a period of four years above the eighth grade of the public schools in this state and shall contain two years of required work which shall be uniform in all high schools of the state. Such course of study for two years of required work shall be laid down by the Superintendent of Public Instruction after due consultation with all county and district high school boards in the state. The course of study for the two years of optional work in all high schools shall be laid down by the county School Board in the county or the district School Board in the case of districts after due consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction; PROVIDED in any high school in the state it may be provided by its directors thereof that all or part of the two years of optional work shall be devoted to industrial training.

The one sentence that was added to this requirement a few years later stated:

In any high school where industrial training is made a part of the course, the required study and industrial training may be interspersed throughout the four years of high school work, as may be deemed best by the Board of Directors. (Oregon Board of Education, 1901)

As both high schools and colleges in Oregon experienced rapid growth after the turn of the century, it became increasingly apparent that the high schools were failing in the task of preparing students for college. The University of Oregon, in an attempt to eliminate its "high school department," adopted new admission standards in 1902 which required the potential student to have acquired 13 units of credit before he would be admitted to the university. The university's admission standards called for the student to have taken four units of English; one and a-half units of Algebra; one unit of Physical Geography; one unit of History, Greek or Roman; one unit of Geometry; and one-and-a-half units of Latin before entering the university. An additional three units of credit were required from optional courses, the admission requirements stated. A unit of credit could be earned in a class which met for 45 minutes, five times a week, for 35 weeks. (Oregon Historical Society, 1929)

The University of Oregon's standards were similar to those being developed at the high school and college level throughout the country. The admission standards were based on a unit system, later known as the Carnegie Unit, which was incorporated into the state's high school graduation requirements by 1913. The 1913 graduation requirements stated that high school students had to earn 15 units of credit, in courses which were at least 40 minutes in length, to obtain a high school diploma. (Oregon Board of Education, 1913)

Despite the fact that the state adopted new standards for high schools over the years, the seemingly conflicting 1903 course of study requirements remained on the books for nearly 40 years. A conflict is apparent in 1935, for instance, where the state's "Program of Studies and High School Standards" specifies that 15 units of credit were needed for graduation, including three units of English (although the student was required to take English for four years), one unit of history, one unit of Civics, and nine electives. A unit of credit was described as a minimum of 120 hours of classroom work in a school year that extended at least 36 weeks.

The State's requirement that English be taken for four years, while in agreement with the entrance requirements of most colleges, seems to be in conflict with the 1903 course of study which states that the state will regulate only two years of study in a four year high school.

The original course of study requirement was finally removed from the books after 1937, and the high school graduation requirements were changed in 1941. The new rules stated that the student needed 16 units of credit to graduate, including three units (four years) of English; two units of social studies; one unit of health and physical education; two units of science, mathematics, or foreign languages; and eight electives. (Oregon School Laws, 1941)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Graduation requirements and minimum standards for schools were revised approximately every four years between 1946 and 1966. The requirements and minimum standards adopted in 1966 remained in effect until the Board's major change in the graduation requirements in 1972. All other aspects of the 1966 minimum standards remain in effect.

The 1966 requirements for high school graduation were listed as:

A/ *A diploma from high school requires four years of actual school experience for students during grades nine through twelve, inclusive, except in special cases approved by the school board.*

B/ *Semester hours: A semester hour is the amount of credit earned in one standard period[2] per week per semester. The traditional unit is thus equivalent to ten semester hours.*

C/ *Number of semester hours required: Four-year high schools (grades nine through twelve, inclusive) require at least 190 semester hours, Senior High Schools (grades ten through twelve, inclusive) require at least 140 semester hours.*

The graduation requirements also allowed credit to be given for classes taken through the state System of Higher Education and its Division of Continuing Education, or other approved colleges and universities and community colleges.

Required subjects under the 1966 standards include three units (four years) of English; two units of social studies; two units of health and physical education; one unit of science; one unit of mathematics; and ten electives.

THE CARNEGIE UNIT. Almost since the inception of Oregon's secondary education, graduation requirements have been based on the so-called Carnegie Unit, a standardized definition of high school work which for many years was used in most of the school districts in the United States. At the turn of the century universities

[2] *55 minutes in a six period class schedule, 50 minutes in a seven period class schedule, and 45 minutes in an eight period class schedule.*

throughout the country were facing the same problem as the University of Oregon; high school graduates in many cases were ill-prepared for college work, and there was no standardized set of high school requirements with which colleges could compare the achievement levels of different applicants. A standardized measure of educational achievement came about in 1909 as the end result of the Carnegie Foundation's attempts to formulate a definition of a college.

In 1904 industrialist Andrew Carnegie contributed $20 million to a trust fund for retired college professors, but the Carnegie Foundation, which was responsible for distributing the money, felt it was necessary to first determine what a college actually was. In order to do this, the trustees believed, a definition of a high school had to be formulated. After that was done, they reasoned, a college could be defined as an institution which accepted graduates from a standard high school. (Lawrence, 1965)

A high school was defined by the Carnegie Foundation as an institution which required 14 units of study. A unit of credit was to be given for a class which met for 120 clock hours per year, and met for five periods per week throughout the school year.

This definition was accepted by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1909, and because of the need for a standardized definition, it was quickly adopted by school districts throughout the country. By 1954, nearly all of the secondary schools and colleges in the United States were using the Carnegie Foundation's definition of a unit of credit as the basis for their educational program.

It was in the 1950's that questions began to arise about the effect of the Carnegie Unit on education. The debate grew in the 1960's, and has continued

up to the present time. The commonly heard arguments supportive of the Carnegie Unit include:

1/ It provided direction to the rampant state of confusion in the secondary school during the era of the 1880's and 1890's.

2/ It eliminated many of the college entrance formalities and rigors.

3/ It united the education process from secondary through graduate level.

4/ It eliminated the need for high school departments at colleges and universities.

5/ It standardized college entrance requirements.

6/ The time devoted to particular types of course work became standardized across the country.

7/ Material presented within course names could be altered without the school or student losing recognition of that course.

8/ It provided for a uniform system of record keeping of students' academic experiences based on time, rather than quality. (Worrell, 1972)

Frequently heard criticisms of the Carnegie Unit include:

1/ The major implementing thrust was provided by the pension contribution to the colleges and universities, thereby causing the concept to be associated with the colleges and universities.

2/ Since the definitions were closely associated with college acceptance of students, undue emphasis was placed on the entire secondary school curriculum to meet standards as interpreted by colleges and universities.

3/ Undue influence was given to the "central curriculum" aimed at college preparation of students.

4/ Undue emphasis was placed on a student's time service at the expense of measurement of quality achieved.

5/ No recognition was given to the level of education of the child entering the institution.

6/ No emphasis was assigned to development in areas such as social adjustment, moral and ethical development, leadership, attitudes, or civic competence.

7/ It had de-emphasized the role of evaluation of learning and the learning process.

8/ Emphasis was placed on earning units of credit for graduation rather than on learning.

9/ It discouraged participation in coursework or experiences not meeting the standard definitions.
(Tompkins and Gaumnitz, 1964)

Without going into all of the arguments for and against the Carnegie Unit, it is safe to say that high school curriculum in Oregon was of a college preparatory nature as a result of heavy reliance on the Carnegie Unit. In the State Department of Education's Biennial Report for 1931-32, it was reported that 274 high schools in the state had been standardized in 1931 and were "qualified to perform college prep work." A strong college bias persisted in high schools despite the fact that a large proportion of high school graduates did not and do not attend college.

The use of the Carnegie Unit in Oregon was evaluated in 1959 when a committee of the Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals developed a study and questionnaire to determine attitudes toward the Carnegie Unit among the state's high school principals.

The results of the study and questionnaire were released in 1961. Sixty-eight percent of the 172 principals who responded to the questionnaire indicated that "the Carnegie Unit was not a problem to them with respect to experimentation or innovation of new educational programs." Another 23 percent felt that reliance on the unit was restrictive, and another 9 percent responded that they "did not know."

The committee felt that most of the reasons listed by the 23 percent who disliked the unit were not valid. The committee stated, for instance, that the Department of Education's guidelines allowed for creativity in curriculum development. The committee recommended that the unit system be retained. (OASSP, 1961)

III. EVENTS PRECEDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

In the 1960's and 1970's a number of educational trends surfaced in Oregon and throughout the United States which ultimately influenced the decision by the Oregon Board of Education to change school graduation requirements. They reflect a desire for:

- Innovations in curriculum content.
- Programs which serve all students, including those who are not college-bound.
- Specific and definable educational outcomes which may be used to measure student achievement.
- A high school diploma which means something in terms of the student's ability to function after graduation.
- Alternative learning settings and opportunities for off-campus learning experiences.
- State and local programs which are oriented to the needs of students.

Events which took place in Oregon at the state and local levels during these decades were supportive of these trends. These events included:

- Innovations by some of the state's school districts in the 1960's which indicated a willingness to develop new educational programs along the lines of competency-based education. A $3.5 million grant from the Ford Foundation was used for "The Oregon Program" which allowed many districts to experiment with innovations between 1962 and 1967.
- A 1969 "Needs Assessment Study" conducted by the Department of Education to determine what the general public, educators, students, and high school dropouts felt were important aspects of the state's educational program.
- A 1969-70 study on high school graduation requirements conducted by the Oregon Association of Secondary School Administrators at the request of Dr. Dale Parnell, Superintendent of Public Instruction. The study included many recommendations later included in the graduation requirements.
- Public meetings in late 1969 and early 1970 which were conducted by Dr. Parnell and some members of the Board of Education. The meetings showed a strong desire by the public for changes in the educational program.

- Legislative action, primarily the development of two education bills by an interim committee of the 1971 legislative session, which signaled legislative desire for change.
- The personal commitment of Dr. Parnell to changes in the school curriculum which would bring about more career education and greater accountability on the part of schools.

CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. The social changes which took place in the 1960's were in part responsible for the many innovations which were being attempted throughout the state and the nation in that decade. When the "Oregon Program," funded by a $3.5 million five-year grant from the Ford Foundation, came into being in 1962, it provided the capital needed for curricular experimentation in some schools. The funds were used to assist the state's small schools, to strengthen teacher training programs in colleges and universities, to finance research using new learning materials and teaching methods, and for other purposes.

In curricular development, there was a good deal of activity aside from that financed by the Oregon Program. One Portland high school, for instance, departed from the traditional system of defined courses and course lengths and developed "clusters" of several courses which students could take to fulfill the state course requirements. A similar program was developed at Hood River Valley High School in 1967, and students in that school may now enroll in clusters in various career areas, as well as in noncareer oriented fields of interest.

Each of the approximately 30 clusters offered at Hood River Valley High School require students to meet the basic requirements of the state and the school district. Aside from the basics, students enroll in courses that relate to their particular areas of interest. The students may choose from cluster options

such as communications, music, forestry, industrial arts, horticulture, and others. Throughout the curriculum, students are tested for the development of minimum competencies.

With the Hood River project, the impetus for change was the construction of a new high school facility in 1967. The Hood River County School District took that opportunity to revamp the curriculum, and when the Board of Education began consideration of the new school graduation requirements in 1971, the district took steps to assure that its curriculum was in line with the state's proposals. No major changes in the curriculum were needed in 1974 in the Hood River district to meet the new graduation requirements.

A different approach to implementing change in the curriculum was taken in the Portland metropolitan area. Local school districts and intermediate education districts from Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties joined together to form the "Tri-County Goals Project" in 1970 with the intent of developing course goal outlines in 12 areas of instruction. The project was intended to fulfill the need for technical support encountered by some districts that wanted to implement "goal-based program development and evaluation." The introduction to the project's report stated:

> *One of the most promising and potentially effective and liberating movements to reach school districts in recent years is the statement of measurable learning outcomes and the development of programs and evaluation techniques to support their attainment.*

The short range objective of the project was "the production of collections of educational goals (learning outcomes) appropriate for use in managing and planning at all school system levels." The long-range purpose was "to help bring consistency to the way school districts develop goal structures for instructional planning and evaluation."

A goal system was developed which suggested the establishment of goals at the district, program, course, and instructional levels, along with the optional measurement tools of "behavioral objective" and "performance objective" to measure how well the student has met the goals. Under the planning system suggested in the project, system level goals would be developed by the Board of Education, and would be very general; program level goals would be established by curriculum specialists, primarily at the district or area level; course goals would be written by teachers and curriculum specialists; and instructional goals, or teaching plans, would be prepared by teachers. (Doherty and Hathaway, 1971)

The work of the Tri-County Goals Project, particularly the project's conception of goal development, had a major influence on the development of the state's new graduation requirements. It also brought attention to the new emphasis on goals and accountability in education. The Tri-County Project later became one of the key resources in assisting districts within the tri-county area and around the state in developing course goals to meet the new graduation requirements.

Other innovations were being developed throughout the state during this period, and many of them were in the direction of accountability and the development of competencies by students.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY. A "Needs Assessment Study" was conducted by the Department of Education in 1969 in response to an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 which required each state to assess its educational needs before they could receive federal funding. The first phase of the study consisted of 120 in-depth interviews with members of the general public, educators, students, and high school dropouts to determine what these people perceived to be the major needs of education. The needs which

were raised in the interviews were given priority ratings; the 27 major concerns were included in a 27-statement opinion questionnaire.

The questionnaire was filled out by a random sample of 800 members of the general public, all of whom were interviewed individually: 469 students, 204 educators, and 52 dropouts. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine not only what the needs of education were, but how well members of the four sub-groups felt the needs were currently being met.

The study showed that the top priority need in education in the eyes of the general public was that "students need to develop behaviors indicative of self-discipline and respect for authority." The second priority need found in the survey was that "students need to have available to them job-related vocational classes." (State Department of Education, 1969)

The top priority needs found in the Needs Assessment Study were approved in December, 1969, as "Critical Needs" to meet the ESEA requirement. Along with the two needs already mentioned, ten other critical needs were included in the list. They were that students need to:

- Learn how to communicate effectively with others.
- Acquire early mastery of the fundamental skills such as reading, writing, and computing.
- Understand and respect other people so they may become effective in human relations.
- Be involved in learning experiences related to social and moral values.
- Experience the acceptance of responsibility and to make decisions.
- Learn accepted health practices and physical effects related to the use of alcohol and drugs.

- Learn of the contributions made to society by all of the various occupational fields and to understand that many fields do not require a four-year college education.
- Explore a wide variety of career opportunities and to learn about job opportunities from representatives of business and industry.
- Have on-the-job opportunities and experiences.
- Become intelligent and economically literate consumers.

The State Board of Education stated that ESEA Title III funds would not be available to programs "that do not set forth objectives stated in performance terms against which the degree of attainment of the objectives can be measured and the progress and outcomes of the project can be evaluated." (Oregon Board of Education, 1969)

The Needs Assessment Study thus became the impetus for one of the first Board actions requiring the measurement of learner outcomes.

The study served as one of the first indicators to the Department of Education that a sizeable portion of the population felt that current student needs were not being met in the schools. There was a good deal of similarity between the needs cited in the Needs Assessment Study and the school graduation requirements later adopted by the Board of Education, and the study had at least an indirect effect on the development of the graduation requirements.

OREGON ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS STUDY. The study of school graduation requirements by the Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals (OASSP) in 1969-70 lended the support of educators to the idea of change in high school curriculum and graduation requirements. The study, conducted at the request of Dr. Parnell by a committee of the OASSP, took nearly six months to complete. The committee's final report was critical of the heavy reliance

placed on the Carnegie Unit and supportive of greater flexibility in graduation requirements:

- The compulsory attendance age should be lowered to 16.[3]
- Minimum standards for high school graduation should include --
  a) A passing score on the GED tests[4] or the equivalent.
  b) Successful completion of 190 semester hours of high school course work.
- Implementation of the proposed graduation requirements should include --
  a) The GED test or equivalent should be under regular study and designed to meet carefully considered minimum needs of individuals in our society.
  b) The 190 semester hours of high school work should be defined so that both in-class and out-of-class experiences may be involved.
  c) The course offerings in any subject should be designed to provide alternative ways to meet state and district goals.
  d) Completion of the credit hours should be possible through testing, formal courses, work, activities carried out with approved agencies and institutions of the community and state, and in such other ways as may be encouraged by the state, established by the local district school board, and designed to meet individual needs based on a total guidance system.
  e) The total resources of the community should be recognized and appropriately used as a proper extension of the school classroom.
  f) The standards of achievement must be variable and, hopefully, based on more than the identification of cognitive goals.

The report stated that "there is a definite need today to state goals, purposes

---

3 *The 1971 Oregon Legislature modified the compulsory attendance law so that youths who are between the ages of 16 and 18 are exempt from the law if they are employed full time, employed part time and in school part time, or who are attending a community college. Also exempt from the law are youths between the ages of 16 and 18 who have the mutual consent of the school administration and the parent.*

4 *GED, or General Equivalency Degree tests, are given to adults and other members of the population who have not graduated from high school to signify that the individual has the skills he would need to obtain a high school diploma. The tests are standardized throughout the country.*

and objectives, designing activities by which objectives may be reached, and to develop accountability on the part of institutions charged with these tasks." (OASSP, 1970)

The committee's report was submitted directly to Dr. Parnell in April, 1970.

TOWN HALL MEETINGS. At the same time that the OASSP was studying the school graduation requirements, Dr. Parnell and some members of the State Board of Education were listening to citizens in a series of public "Town Hall" meetings throughout the state. Over 2,000 persons attended the meetings, which were held in 14 cities from October, 1969, to January, 1970, to express their opinions on priorities for education.

Those who attended the meetings generally agreed with the Board of Education's proposed priorities for schools. A booklet called "Oregonians Speak Out," developed after the public meetings to compile the information and opinions gathered in the 14 cities, stated:

> *If frequency of mention is a criterion for public concern about a topic, then primary education development, career education development, including career counseling, community college development, improving education for the disadvantaged, and adding the Fourth "R" -- Responsibility -- are all of widespread public interest. They are the Board's top instruction-related priorities.*

Other top priorities of the Board included improving school finance structures, closing the communication gap between the schools and the public, improving teacher education and certification, improving the management of schools and community colleges, auditing educational programs as a means of accountability, and extending educational opportunity, a priority which included these objectives:

Make available to each student a planned program under school supervision with completion of a full secondary program by each student as the goal; determine the feasibility of a 12-month school; study the applicability in 1970 of the compulsory attendance law; and review current high school graduation requirements in terms of their effectiveness in meeting individual student needs. (Wright, 1970)

This list of priorities was adopted by the Board of Education in March, 1970. Since that time the list has been revised.

The Board found that the concerns expressed at the Town Hall meetings were similar to the priority needs which came out of the Needs Assessment Study in 1969. The need for developing the "Fourth R" and the need for career education development were frequently mentioned in one form or another many times in the Needs Assessment Study as well as the Town Hall meetings. (Wright, 1970) This fact was probably influential in the decision by the Board of Education to include Career Education and Citizenship Education in the new school graduation requirements.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION. In the interim between the 1971 and 1973 legislative sessions, two bills dealing with school goals and curriculum were being developed by the state senate's Interim Committee on Education at the request of the 1971 legislature. Senate Bills 1 and 2 both died in the 1973 legislature, but they nevertheless had an influence on the development and approval of new school graduation requirements. Since the bills were being criticized by many educators as unrealistic and overly prescriptive, they provided an incentive to develop graduation requirements within the Department of Education and the State Board, rather than allowing regulations to be established through the legislature.

The purpose of Senate Bill 1 was to "assign and allocate responsibilities for achievement of educational goals among the State Board of Education, the local school districts, the community colleges, the State Board of Higher Education, the state colleges and universities, and the Educational Coordinating Council."

Educational goals proposed in the bill were:

1/ Individuals equipped with the skills and knowledge essential in a complex society.

2/ Lives enriched by the arts and humanities.

3/ Individuals able and willing to accept their responsibilities as citizens.

4/ Individuals qualified for entry into occupations leading to economic self-sufficiency and able to provide society with qualified manpower.

5/ The generation and dissemination of knowledge acquired by research.

6/ Individuals physically healthy to meet the demands of society.

7/ Provision of a lifetime of learning.

Senate Bill 2 had as its purpose to "define and describe basic education for elementary and secondary education (and to) allocate responsibility between the state and local school districts in achieving the basic education of the student. The bill was more specific than Senate Bill 1, listing the abilities the student should have developed upon completion of a given educational program. For example, the bill stated that when the student had completed the basic mathematics program, he should be able to demonstrate:

A/ Ability to compute accurately and make practical use of mathematical skills.

B/ Ability to employ accurately the fundamental number skills.

C/ Ability to understand and use graphs, tables, charts, statistics, weights and measures.

D/ Ability to translate computation problems into mathematical terms.

A total of twenty such statements were listed in the areas of language arts and reading, mathematics, science, citizenship, history, career opportunities, and health and physical education.[5]

Senate Bill 2 would have attempted to accomplish many of the same things as the new graduation requirements. However, the end result of the specifically-worded bill would have been requirements which would be much less flexible than those which were ultimately adopted.

DR. PARNELL'S PERSONAL COMMITMENT. The effect that Dr. Parnell's personal commitment to new educational concepts had on the development of the graduation requirements cannot be minimized. Even before the OASSP study and Town Hall meetings, both of which suggested the need for career education, Dr. Parnell was speaking publicly on the need for a greater emphasis on career-oriented programs. In August 1968, for instance, he told a group of 900 teachers and administrators:

> *The main problem for most youngsters in high school is motivation... why not develop "job cluster" courses to prepare a student for a particular field or work, just as we advise certain types of courses for those who want to enter college? (Parnell, 1968)*

One month later, Dr. Parnell told the Portland City Club, "*The whole philosophy of my theory of education is relevance or reality.*" In the same speech, Dr. Parnell said he hoped to develop more a "product report" type of assessment in the future which would tell what is being accomplished in the schools.

In December, 1969, Dr. Parnell elaborated on the concept of accountability in

---

[5] *A list of all of the basic competencies included in Senate Bill 2 is included in Appendix A.*

the schools. He told a statewide meeting of school board members:

> *The public has a right to ask two questions in particular and we had better be ready to answer. The questions are: "What are you trying to do in the schools" and "How well do you do it?" We will need more public money and we will have to be accountable with public funds. We will have to let the public know what it is buying. Too often we fail to develop performance criteria, whereas we should have criteria specifying what the student is expected to achieve and his degree of skill.*

Dr. Parnell added that in the 1970's the state's schools would "move towards acccuntability." (Parnell, 1969)

Although it is likely that modifications in the graduation requirements would have been made even without this strong support from the superintendent, the changes might not have been as rapid nor as far-reaching without it.

• • • • •

IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS PROPOSALS

It was in the context of these events that the first draft of new school graduation requirements was prepared by the Department of Education. The draft proposal, along with a plan of action for implementing the new requirements, was completed on September 8, 1971.

The proposed change in graduation requirements marked the first time that revisions in the requirements were considered separately from the larger "Minimum Standards for Oregon Schools," of which the graduation requirements are a part. One of the main reasons for the independent consideration of the school graduation requirements was the hope that the time between consideration of change

and the implementation of new requirements would be reduced by such a procedure. At the time that the first draft of the new graduation requirements was being developed, considerable effort had already gone into revising the "Minimum Standards." However, the new graduation requirements were approved in September 1974, while the proposed changes in the "Minimum Standards" are still under consideration, with adoption expected in December 1974.

DRAFT PROPOSALS DEVELOPED. The first draft of the high school graduation requirements proposal was presented to the Board of Education at their September 29, 1971, public hearing. The Board responded by approving a plan which called for the draft proposal to be given wide circulation to various organizations throughout the state.

The proposal was distributed to the Oregon Association of Secondary School Administrators (OASSA), the Parent-Teachers Association, and many educational interest groups between October and December, 1971. Representatives from some of the groups met with Department of Education personnel during the winter months, and from the input of these groups, a new draft was developed and completed on January 6, 1972. This document was made public at the OASSA winter conference being held in Eugene.

A third draft, which was completed on March 17, 1972, took into consideration the comments and criticisms which were voiced at the OASSA conference. This draft was presented to the public in hearings held in Pendleton, Coos Bay, Salem, and Klamath Falls in the spring and summer of 1972. The response to the new graduation requirements at these hearings was generally supportive.

The Board of Education reviewed a fourth draft of the proposed revisions in

the spring of 1972, but did not take action until September 22, 1972. On that day the new school graduation requirements were approved, with an implementation date set for no later than the graduating class of 1978.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND FINAL DRAFTS. A review of the various draft proposals will show that there was an actual change in philosophy on the state's role in education between the first and final drafts. Although both drafts included the concept of minimum survival level competencies as part of the requirements for graduation, the first draft listed all of the survival skills a student would need to graduate, while the final version left the decision of determining survival level competencies to the individual school districts.

Among the 44 competencies included in the first draft but not present in the document adopted by the Board were: the student must be able to

- Read a newspaper at a proficiency level
- Accurately compute the difference in cost per unit between small and large quantity purchases
- Describe the procedure for filing a permit to build a home
- Accurately balance a checkbook
- Demonstrate safe driving
- Change an automobile wheel.

Local school districts have the option of requiring these or other survival competencies from their students; however, now the choice of survival skills is left to the district, while in the first draft the needed survival skills were mandated by the state.

The two key issues which were debated in the development of the graduation requirements were equality of educational opportunity and state versus local

control of the school curriculum. Opponents of the first draft of the graduation requirements argued that the proposal would give the state too much control of the curriculum and educational programs of local school districts, which have traditionally worked to maintain autonomy in defining programs to meet local needs. On the other hand, the supporters of the final draft were primarily concerned with guaranteeing equal educational opportunity in terms of specified minimum outcomes for all of the state's students. They believed that by leaving the development of survival level competencies to local districts, there might be inequities in educational opportunity.

While supporters of local control won the debate with the adoption of the final draft, the issue of educational equality was left unresolved. Members of the Department of Education have found that there are some similarities in the minimum survival level competencies developed by small districts and those developed in the state's large school districts. However, there is no guarantee that students in all districts will have equal educational opportunities, and the research done by Ken Bierly in 1974 (Appendix A) reveals that there are many more dissimilarities than there are similarities in the minimum competency statements being developed by districts.

Although the issue of local autonomy was resolved in favor of supporters of strong local control, the question of equal educational opportunity will continue to be a focus for debate in discussions of graduation requirements.

Other criticisms of the new graduation requirements proposal were consistent in discussions of all of the draft proposals. The Oregon Association of Secondary School Administrators was represented by its Curriculum Commission and Educational Policies Commission at the September 21, 1972, hearing when the

requirements were adopted, and they urged the Board of Education to postpone a decision on new graduation requirements. The OASSA stated the need for specific guidelines and clarification of the requirements, and suggested that pilot projects be authorized by the Board to test the proposed changes. The OASSA's message to the Board was, *"This is a complex and critical move and we feel uncertain about its impact -- it should be tested before final and total adoption is made."*

In a section-by-section review of the graduation requirements which were ultimately adopted by the Board, the OASSA had many comments and questions. Some of them are listed below.

Unit of Credit --

- There needs to be some standard of equivalence for summer school and night school.
- Programs and granting of credits by community colleges need to be coordinated.
- What are the standards for credit for "away from school experience"? Home instruction?

Planned Course --

- If districts were to implement merely the writing of planned courses, it would necessitate a tremendous outlay of funds.
- Small schools with limited staff and resources and multiple preparations of teachers would experience great difficulty in meeting this requirement.

Credit by Examination --

- How would testing in the affective domain be accomplished?
- Where will districts obtain the staff and time to test?

In other areas of the requirements, the OASSA stated that the Personal Finance requirement should be included in existing courses, rather than as a new and

separate course; that there were no guidelines for the development of minimum competencies, that an increase in credit requirements might restrict the flexibility of schools when dealing with "unmotivated students," and that performance indicators and survival level competencies might not be needed because "the diploma currently certifies that a student has acquired certain skills." (OASSA, 1970)

While educators had many doubts about the new graduation requirements when they were under consideration, students who were exposed to the proposed graduation requirement revisions were nearly unanimous in their approval. In a summer leadership camp of high school students held in July, 1972, 85% of the respondents to a questionnaire stated that the proposed requirements were more satisfactory than the existing ones, and 88% of the students felt that the concept of performance requirements, or minimum survival level competencies, should be incorporated in the requirements. Comments made by students at the leadership camp suggested that the students were supportive of the new proposed requirements because they would help students make the transition from student to a member of society, and because they would provide greater educational opportunities for the students. (State Department of Education, 1972)

• • • • •

V. A REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

The school graduation requirements which were ultimately approved by the Board of Education have three components -- units of credit, attendance, and

competencies. Although changes were made in the credit and attendance requirements, the addition of the all-new section on minimum survival competencies is the most fundamental change from the old requirements.

ATTENDANCE. The requirement for attendance has been modified to state that a high school diploma will represent the completion of 12 years of school work. In the past the requirement has been geared to a four year educational program, which is inconvenient for districts with junior high schools and for nonconventional educational systems.

Under the attendance requirement, local districts have the options of deciding whether to offer programs longer or shorter than the conventional four year period for exceptional students and whether or not to waive some of the on-campus attendance requirements.

UNITS OF CREDIT. Many changes have been made in the school credit requirements. Under the old system 19 units of credit, each consisting of 145 hours of classwork, were needed to meet the credit requirements in an Oregon high school. The new requirements call for the student to obtain 21 units of credit of 130 hours each in order to graduate, and the credit is earned in various "areas of study" rather than in required subjects. The new required areas of study are Personal Finance, Career Education, and Citizenship Education. Other credit requirements have been modified.

A listing of the credit requirements under the old system is given on page 31 of this report.

Credit requirements under the old system:

Subject	Units of Credit
English/Language Arts	3
Social Studies	2
Health and Physical Education	2
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Electives	10
TOTAL	19

The required areas of study under the new graduation requirements:

Area of Study	Units of Credit
Communications	3
Social Science	1
Citizenship Education	1
Health Education	1
Physical Education	1
Laboratory Science	1
Mathematics	1
Personal Finance	1
Career Education	1
Electives	10
TOTAL	21

The new Personal Finance requirement is aimed at "helping students develop the competencies needed to cope with the financial concerns related to their life roles as consumers." (OAR 22-105)

The Career Education area of study is expected to "help students develop general occupational competencies needed to function effectively within a broad range of career clusters or related occupations."[6] (OAR 22-105)

---

6 *A career cluster is the grouping of vocations by occupational areas. The majority of vocations are placed into a few groupings, which are determined by occupational skills, knowledge, and understandings common to all occupations in the cluster. The State Department of Education has thus far developed 13 career clusters, and the task is not yet completed.*

The Citizenship Education area of study, although not defined in the graduation requirements, will in many districts deal with the development of an understanding of the democratic process and the responsibility of the citizen toward society. Among the concerns which conceivably could be dealt with in this area of study would be the understanding of zoning, how to vote intelligently, and an understanding of the function of different government agencies.

Although the term "area of study" will be synonymous with "subject" in some districts, there is a distinct difference between the two terms. No longer will there be the need to place all students in the same English class, for instance, regardless of what their career or life goals are. If the districts provide the options, a student would have the opportunity to enroll in any number of courses or mini-courses to meet the new "Communications" requirement, depending on what his interests are. In any of the areas of study in the new requirements, the student may have courses available to him that meet his specific interests, whereas in the past, many required courses have been able to touch only lightly on a number of interests, and all too frequently were taught as college preparatory courses. The variety of courses offered to a student to fill the high school requirements have been dubbed "selectives."[7]

The shift in terminology from subject to area of study also allows the student to meet credit requirements for the required areas of study by applying portions of a number of different courses towards meeting the requirement. For instance, the school district may decide that the portion of a home economics course

---

[7] *A selective course is one among several course offerings that will fulfill a required unit of credit, rather than an elective. For instance, in the required area of Career Education, a selective might be "Furniture and Cabinet Making."*

which deals with budgeting and marketing fulfills part of the requirement for a unit of credit in Personal Finance. If a quarter of the course work dealt with financial matters, the student would have fulfilled one-fourth of the Personal Finance requirement, and would obtain three-fourths of a credit in the non-mandatory home economics course.

One of the stipulations in the new Administrative Rule 22-105 to 22-135 (the school graduation requirements) is that school districts must conduct a "needs assessment" on the electives it offers. Districts may choose to conduct such an assessment annually, every two or four years, or use a different time span. In the section dealing with electives, the graduation requirements state that:

> *Local districts shall develop elective offerings which provide students the opportunities to earn a minimum of 10 elective units of high school credit. The development of these electives shall be structured in terms of the personal, social, career, and post-high school educational needs of students. Vocational, scientific, fine arts, modern language, and humanities needs of students shall be assessed in developing appropriate electives. Local districts are encouraged to provide varied experiences in the fine arts and humanities.*

Although a needs assessment is not required on the so-called selectives, it is expected that such an evaluation will be conducted by many of the districts offering such an option.

Even though students must attain two more units of credit under the new requirements, the amount of time spent in class will remain about the same. Under the old requirements, 145 hours of class work were needed to attain one unit of credit, but under the new requirements, only 130 hours are needed. So, 2,755 hours were spent in class to meet the 19 units which were required in the past, and 2,730 hours will be spent in class under the new system. (Bierly, 1974)

Local districts have been given a number of options in the area of credit requirements. The district may decide, in correlation with the option of waiving some of the on-campus credit requirements, to allow credit for college courses, for work experience, or for independent study; the district may decide to allow credit by examination, so students will be able to waive required courses; and districts may decide to increase the credit requirements, the elective offerings, and the clock-hour lengths of the courses.

The fact that the credit requirements have been retained in the high school curriculum means that the unit of credit will still play a role in Oregon education. However, the new portion of the graduation requirements -- minimum survival level competencies -- also will play a role in the educational process in the future.

MINIMUM SURVIVAL LEVEL COMPETENCIES. The "survival level competency" aspect of the graduation requirements has probably been the most widely discussed and least understood of the many changes.

Under the new graduation requirements, every student is expected to attain the minimum skills considered necessary for survival in a complex society. These minimum survival skills will be in the areas of Personal Development, Social Responsibility, and Career Development. Under the Board of Education's broad guidelines minimum survival competencies in the area of Personal Development would enable the student to:

A/ Read, listen, speak, analyze, write;

B/ Compute using the basic processes;

C/ Understand basic scientific and technological processes;

D/ Develop and maintain a healthy mind and body

E/ Develop and maintain the role of a lifelong learner.

In the area of Social Responsibility, the Administrative Rule states that students should develop minimum competencies to function effectively and responsibly as:

A/ A citizen of the community, state, and nation;

B/ A citizen in interaction with his or her environment;

C/ A citizen on the streets and highways;

D/ A consumer of goods and services.

In the area of Career Development, the requirements say that the student shall develop minimum competencies that will be needed to function effectively within a career cluster, or within a broad range of occupations.

While the state's graduation requirements present a very broad outline of what the student's minimum abilities should be upon completion of high school, local districts are expected to be more specific in determining the needed minimum competencies, as well as determining what constitutes a "survival level" of education. The first step for local districts is to delineate exactly what minimum competencies their students should achieve, and then they must specify "performance indicators" which will measure the student's attainment of the needed skills. As an example, one district has decided that a minimum competency which its students must achieve is that "the student will demonstrate a working knowledge of simple machines." They have decided that the best place to test for such a minimum competency is in a science class, so it is listed as a part of the learning goal in that class. The district has added performance indicators to determine if the minimum competency has been attained; they state:

Given a bicycle as an example, the student will point out two simple machines used in a compound machine.

Given drawings of a variety of levers, the student will decide the best point to apply effort to each lever to the teacher's satisfaction.

Given a series of illustrations, the student will select those in which work is being done with 90 percent accuracy. (Cascade Union High School)

The minimum survival level competencies developed by districts are to be incorporated into the curriculum in the most convenient way. Some courses may not contain any of the minimum survival competencies, while others may have several. In some districts, a specific test may be developed to see if the minimum competencies have been met, but the intent of the requirement is to incorporate the learning needed to meet these competencies into the curriculum, rather than to isolate them and test them separately. Regardless of where the development of these minimum survival competencies is placed in the curriculum, by the end of the twelfth grade the student should have achieved all of the survival level competencies established by the district.

The survival education and minimum competency portions of the new graduation requirements are not intended to take up a major portion of the high school curriculum. In fact, the achievement of minimum competencies will only require a minor portion of the time and effort which make up the total educational program for most students. Even if a student develops all of the minimum competencies, he is not assured of passing grades or a high school diploma. It is conceivable that a student could achieve the minimum competency in a course and still fail the course, because the standard for a passing grade is likely to be higher than the standard of achieving a minimum competency. The primary purpose of the requirement for survival level competencies as stated earlier, is to assure that students are prepared for the realities of life upon completing

12 years of education, as well as to provide a system of accountability on the part of schools. Since students will not acquire their diplomas until they have demonstrated these survival level skills, the high school diploma will once again have some meaning.

Local districts have some options available to them which are pertinent to the competencies portion of the graduation requirements. First, the district may decide to test for minimum competencies in areas other than the three outlined by the Board of Education. The district may also decide to give pre-tests to entering ninth graders, which would indicate their ability to meet minimum competencies as well as show their overall achievement level. Finally, the district may decide to award "certificates of competency" to students who leave high school before earning a diploma, or who complete their high school education without having earned all of the needed credits or survival level competencies. Such a certificate would indicate that the student has acquired specific skills despite the fact that he has not graduated from high school.

One possible effect of allowing districts to develop certificates of competency is that the stigma of not completing high school may be minimized. Even though the student has not graduated from high school, he has demonstrated certain skills, a fact which should help him in the job market.

The concept of survival education is based on psychologist Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of human needs, frequently referred to by Dr. Parnell in discussions of changes in graduation requirements. The most fundamental human need, according to Maslow, is for survival. Once survival is assured, the next human need which can be dealt with is security; once this is assured, love is given top consideration, followed by self-esteem and finally self-actualization. The

concern of Dr. Parnell and the Board of Education was that the need for self-actualization was being given the highest priority in education, even though survival was not assured. While Maslow's conception of survival differed from that envisioned by Dr. Parnell, Maslow's model served to point out the different planes of human needs.

PLANNED COURSE STATEMENTS. One major portion of the graduation requirements that does not fit into any of the above three categories, but encompasses all of them, is the requirement that school districts develop "planned course statements" for each course taught for credit in a secondary school. The statement must include a list of goals to be achieved in the course, the general course content and expected learning activities, and it must tell what the student can expect to gain from the course in terms of skills, knowledge, and values. Furthermore, the statement must indicate the amount of credit offered for the course, whether off-campus experience can be applied to course work, and the other options available to the student. In courses where minimal survival level competencies are to be tested, they must be listed, and performance indicators may be listed at the district's option.

The purposes of the planned course statements are to provide public access to what is being taught in the schools so that greater public participation in school matters is encouraged, to give students an idea of what to expect in the different courses available in the school and, most importantly, to assure that there are well-defined goals in each course for student learning outcomes. If a district wants to expand the usefulness of the statements, it may use them in curriculum planning. By using the statements for planning, there might be a reduction in the number of gaps and overlaps in the curriculum from one course or grade level to another.

Although a "typical" planned course statement probably does not exist, a sample statement prepared by the Department of Education's task force (1974) shows what such a statement should contain. The course title in the sample is "Dollars and Sense," a half-year required course which would provide one-half of the credit needed in the Personal Finance area of study.

The "course overview" states:

> *This course is designed to meet the needs of students in their current role as a "consumer of goods and services." Activities involving earning, saving, spending, advertising, banking, and buying will be the focus of the course. Student involvement in real-life experiences will be emphasized so that basic knowledge and skills related to personal spending can be clarified.*

The "course goals" are:

- *The student will be able to estimate the take-home pay of any job for which he applies.*
- *The student will know the correct uses of banking services which aid in personal money management.*
- *The student will know the cost of credit will vary according to many factors involved in a transaction.*
- *The student will be able to analyze the effect of advertising on his choice of goods and services.*
- *The student will know the elements of credit will vary according to many factors involved in a transaction.*
- *The student will know the elements of careful shopping and buying procedures.*
- *The student will know the rights and responsibilities of buyer and seller in the marketplace.*

The "minimum survival graduation competencies" are:

- *The student will know the difference between the terms of gross pay and take-home pay.*
- *The student will be able to write a check.*

- *The student will be able to balance a checkbook.*
- *The student will be able to reconcile a bank statement.*
- *The student will be able to identify consumer practices which are considered responsible.*

School districts are not required to submit their planned course statements to the Department of Education for approval. However, the statements must be on file at the district office and available for review by the Department. Districts are also required to establish a system of record-keeping to keep track of whether students have met the minimum competencies established by the districts.

The overall effect of all of these changes on the educational system depends in a large part on the initiative and attitudes of those affected by the requirements. If the spirit of the new requirements is carried out, and the entire educational staff as well as members of the public become involved in the development of the high school program, a noticeable change is likely to take place. In order to document this, however, observations must be made in the schools that implemented the requirements in September, 1974.

• • • • •

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

The reaction by the Department of Education to the approval of new school graduation requirements was immediate. The first step toward assisting districts in the implementation process was taken less than three weeks after the requirements were adopted, and assistance in various forms and with varying degrees of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of intensity has continued up to the present time. A chronology of the actions taken by the Department of Education includes:

- *October, 1972: Graduation Requirements Steering Committee was appointed to coordinate activities within the Department of Education.*
- *November, 1972: Six pilot districts were chosen to develop guidelines for the implementation of the graduation requirements. A Task Force was developed within the Department to provide guidance and assistance to the pilot groups.*
- *May, 1973: Pilot groups completed their work and synthesized it into booklet form for dissemination throughout the state in the following months.*
- *September, 1973: A film explaining the new graduation requirements was completed.*
- *October-November, 1973: Ten one-day workshops were held throughout the state to assist districts in meeting the new requirements, and additional assistance was provided at the request of districts.*
- *January-February, 1974: Eight workshops were held in various parts of the state to familiarize high school counselors with the effects graduation requirements would have on guidance and counseling programs.*
- *January-April, 1974: The Oregon Small Schools Program[8] held a series of workshops throughout the state in January and February to initiate small districts to the new requirements. "Writing Skills Workshops" were held in March and April to assist districts in that aspect of the requirements.*
- *March, 1974: Work began on guideline booklets on "Planned Course Statements and Record Keeping," developed on contract by educators outside the Department of Education. Draft versions of the guidelines were completed in June, and the final booklets were completed in September.*
- *March, 1974: A task force was initiated within the Department of Education to make recommendations on what role the department should take in the future to assist districts. Recommendations were completed in May.*

---

[8] *The Small Schools Program became a function of the Department of Education in June, 1974. Prior to that time the program, although housed within the Department of Education, was a separate entity operating on federal funds.*

- *April-May, 1974: Workshops were held which dealt with problems in measurement of educational outcomes as they related to the graduation requirements for the benefit of superintendents of small- and medium-sized school districts.*

- *June, 1974: A Small Schools Summer Institute program was held at Willamette University to further provide assistance to school districts.*

- *June, 1974: State Department of Education staff workshops were held to familiarize Department of Education personnel with the scope of the graduation requirements.*

- *August, 1974: Five half-hour television shows were broadcast on the state's educational network which reviewed the requirements for the public and for educators.*

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS STEERING COMMITTEE. The first official action of the Department of Education in response to the new graduation requirements was to establish a steering committee within the Department to guide future actions relating to the graduation requirements. Twelve persons from the department served on the steering committee, which had its first meeting October 9, 1972. The committee's first responsibility was to develop guidelines for applications from schools wishing to serve as pilot groups in developing guidelines for the implementation of the requirements. The idea of selecting pilot projects to develop guidelines came from the state superintendent, Dr. Dale Parnell.

The steering committee is still in existence two years after it began, and meets periodically to further guide department actions and recommendations on the graduation requirements.

PILOT PROJECTS CHOSEN. Thirteen districts applied for the six pilot projects which were to be established under the auspices of the Department of Education, and financed by $40,000 in federal grant money. The announcement of the districts chosen for the pilot projects came on November 30, 1972.

The six applications which were accepted were for the Coos Bay, Eugene, Klamath Falls, and Lebanon school districts, for the combined Intermediate Education Districts of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties, and for the Tri-Co League, which was made up of the school districts of Crow, Lowell, Mapleton, McKenzie, Monroe, Siletz, and Waldport.

The pilot groups aimed their efforts at developing sample minimum competency statements and performance indicators in the areas of Personal Development Education, Social Responsibility Education, and Career Development Education. Also, the pilot projects were to develop information that would assist districts in meeting the state's administrative requirements, which included submitting a plan to the State Department of Education on how and when the graduation requirements would be implemented in the district. The deadline for the implementation plan to be on file with the State Department of Education was July 1, 1974.

A task force was formed within the Department of Education to assist the six pilot districts in completing the guidelines by no later than April 30, 1974. Members of the task force became project managers providing guidance and assistance to the pilot groups.

PILOT PROJECT GUIDELINES COMPLETED. Not all of the six pilot groups were able to thoroughly develop all aspects of the graduation requirements, because time and money were limiting factors in the pilot projects. In May, 1973, members of the six pilot projects met in Eugene to synthesize their work into a completed document, which was developed from portions of each of the projects.

The work of the pilot projects was released in four separate booklets. (Oregon Board of Education, 1973) The first one dealt with administrative requirements, and suggested the following dateline for implementation:

- August, 1973 -- *The district superintendent should study the (pilot project) guide, appoint and orient a project manager, and work with the project manager on a preliminary budget.*
- August, 1973 -- *The project manager should select a steering committee.*
- September, 1973 -- *The steering committee should be initiated and given assignments.*
- November, 1973 -- *The steering committee should prepare a final report and gain approval from the superintendent and school board.*
- January, 1974 -- *The plan should receive approval from the State Department of Education.*[9]
- February, 1974 -- *Development and implementation should begin -- work should begin on identification of minimum competencies and performance indicators.*
- April, 1974 -- *Identification of competencies and performance indicators should be completed.*
- April-August, 1974 -- *Materials for ninth grade program should be completed and distributed.*
- September, 1974 -- *Requirements must be implemented, and work should continue on the development of plans for other grade levels.*

As expected, some of the state's districts were able to keep up with the suggested timeline or even stay ahead of it, while others fell behind. Some districts developed "networks" which included many interacting segments of an implementation program.

Booklets II, III, and IV provided samples of program goals, minimum competencies and performance indicators in the areas of personal development, social responsibility and career education.

---

[9] *The Department of Education's deadline was July 1, 1974.*

An evaluation of the work of the six pilot districts noted that the projects had varying degrees of success. The Eugene project did a "superior" job of developing specific performance indicators, the evaluation noted, but some of the indicators were geared to testing skills at the intermediate level, rather than the minimum survival level. The strong point of the Coos Bay project, the department felt, was their development of administrative guidance material and an implementation timeline. The Tri-Co League project followed the same pattern as Coos Bay, and showed the effectiveness of having small districts work together on graduation requirements. The Lebanon project was able to successfully identify career competencies in communication and social and personal development. The Klamath Falls project worked primarily on minimum competencies and performance indicators in the areas of personal development and social responsibility. Finally, the Tri-county project, which had the advantage of large time and money investments by the districts involved in the project, developed a high quality report in virtually every area of the new requirements, according to the Department of Education's evaluation. (State Department of Education, 1973)

The data derived from the synthesis workshop was rewritten and put into booklet form during the summer of 1973, and the booklets were printed and distributed in September, 1973. The quantity printed at that time was insufficient to meet the demand because of funding problems; however, the guidelines were later printed in larger quantities. A four page mini-report was developed after the pilot project work was completed, which explained the main points of the graduation requirements. Thousands of these mini-reports were distributed at meetings and workshops dealing with graduation requirements.

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS MOVIE. A 20 minute movie outlining Oregon's new graduation requirements was produced by filmmaker J. Hal Whipple of Eugene on contract with the Department of Education. The film provided examples of how survival-based education would affect the schools, and states that students in the 1930's were "experience rich, but information poor" -- a premise which has influenced curriculum up to the present. However, the movie says, students are now "information rich, and experience poor" so there is a need for a shift in educational philosophy, which the new graduation requirements are intended to fill.

The movie, completed in September, 1973, was broadcast on commercial and educational television, and has been used to initiate audiences to the new requirements.

ONE-DAY WORKSHOPS. Over 1,000 educators were formally introduced to the graduation requirements in one-day workshops held in ten cities in October and November, 1972. The objectives of the workshops were to determine educator reaction to the Department of Education's publications, primarily the pilot project guidelines; to provide basic training to project managers and principals from school districts; to outline the role of the administrator, teacher, student, school board, and community; to offer sessions on management, personal development, social responsibility, environment, career development, and guidance; and to explain why and how elementary personnel need to be involved in the development of the local plan.

The workshops were held in Pendleton, The Dalles, Bend, Medford, Coos Bay, Eugene, Astoria, Salem, and Portland (two workshops).

It was at the Salem workshop that faculty members and students from the Oregon College of Education received their initial training on the graduation requirements. The college has provided a great deal of assistance to small schools and educators throughout Oregon in meeting the requirements since that time.

It should be noted that, while these workshops represent the formal actions of the Department of Education, much work took place on an informal basis. An estimated 500 to 1,000 meetings have taken place between staff members of the SDE and local districts to answer individual questions about the graduation requirements. The questions were not always fully answered because the answers simply were not available. However, many specialists from the Department offered whatever assistance they could to school districts when their assistance was requested.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING WORKSHOPS. The effects the graduation requirements would have on guidance and counseling were outlined in Counselors' Workshops held in January and February, 1974. Among the discussion questions presented to counselors at the workshops were:

- Do you have a comprehensive approach for meeting the individual needs of students for personal and educational guidance?
- Does your program have enough flexibility built into its total system so that reasonable alternatives are available for each student?
- Is your guidance program the keystone in providing this flexibility?
- Will your program include provisions for helping students to use a Forecast Guide?[10]

---

10 *These questions were included in the pilot project guidelines and presented to the counselors from the guidelines. A Forecast Guide is a checklist of student achievement of minimum competencies.*

Other discussion at the workshops revolved around the concept of survival education and some of the requirements included in OAR 22-105 to 22-135.

The workshops were held at Treasure Valley, Blue Mountain, Rogue River, Southwest Oregon, and Mt. Hood Community Colleges, the State Library in Salem, Springfield High School and Pacific University.

SMALL SCHOOLS WORKSHOPS. The first major phase of the Small Schools Program's involvement with the graduation requirements began in January, 1974, when the program held workshops for small schools in three locations. The workshops, held in Pendleton, Salem, and Cottage Grove, sought to identify the role of the project manager, to deal with the tasks related to the completion of the district's implementation plan, and to develop a timeline for implementation of the requirements.

These workshops were followed by Writing Skills Workshops in March and April, 1974, which were held in Condon, Pendleton, Crane, and Salem. The objectives of these workshops were to define the graduation requirements terminology; to show the importance of involvement from kindergarten through the twelfth grade; to provide training in the writing and use of goals, planned course statements, survival level competencies, and performance indicators; and to provide ideas on the necessity for improved guidance service and record keeping to implement the graduation requirements.

PLANNED COURSE STATEMENT/RECORD KEEPING GUIDELINES. In a contractual agreement with the Department of Education, the Tri-County Graduation Requirements Project developed two booklets between the months of March and May, 1974, which dealt with major aspects of the graduation requirements. Dozens of educators

worked on developing a booklet which provided numerous samples of what a planned course statement should include and how to go about developing a thorough record keeping system. The contents of a sample planned course statement from the booklet has already been cited (pages 34 and 35). The booklet on guidelines for record keeping provided specific information for schools on how to record the students' grades, attendance, minimum competency achievement, and other information. The booklets were released in draft form to school districts in June, 1974, and in final form in September, 1974.

Although both of the subjects dealt with in these booklets were considered in the pilot projects, the booklets contained new concepts which had come about in the one year of experience educators had had with the requirements.

1974 GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS TASK FORCE. The Graduation Requirements Steering Committee within the Department of Education appointed a task force in March, 1974, to make recommendations on what role the department should assume in dealing with high school graduation requirements. The task force split itself into an "action group" and a "planning group." The "action group" was to deal with the immediate, short term steps the Department should take with regard to the graduation requirements; their recommendations, completed May 22, 1974, were:

- Encourage school district participation in the Small Schools Summer Institute, to be held in June.
- Provide assistance throughout the summer to districts unable to attend the workshop.
- Conduct an in-staff workshop to prepare staff members to provide assistance to the districts.

All three of these recommendations were carried out.

The "planning group," which was concerned with the long range role of the Department of Education, also completed their recommendations in May, 1974, and they included:

- Establish a process for combining graduation requirements and minimum standards implementation efforts.
- In order to meet the above goal, the Department of Education should provide an Educational Program Director, two assistant educational program directors, one secretary, and 14 regional consultants from July, 1974, to February, 1978. A phase-out of the program would begin in 1978, and the final position would be terminated in 1981.
- A four-phase implementation schedule should be developed, with specific deadlines for each phase of the implementation program.
- An estimated budget of $165,000 should be approved annually over a four year period to put the proposals into effect.

These proposals and other possibilities are currently under consideration by SDE officials. Upon completion of the recommendations, some members of the task force worked with the Tri-county group on the two booklets.

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS MEASUREMENT WORKSHOPS. Three two-day regional workshops were held in April and May, 1974, to consider the problems of measuring educational outomes in relation to the new graduation requirements. Each of the workshops was attended by persons representing 15 to 30 school districts. The agenda for the workshops consisted of an overview of the graduation requirements, a basic plan for an evaluation system, the basics of setting educational outcomes, and the basics of certifying survival level competencies. Time was allowed at the workshop sessions for districts to develop their own materials, which could be critiqued by experts on hand from the Department of Education, the Lane County Intermediate Education District, and the Multnomah County Intermediate Education District, sponsors of the workshops.

The workshops were held in Roseburg, Pendleton, and Portland.

SMALL SCHOOLS SUMMER INSTITUTE. The 1974 summer institute of the Small Schools Program dealt with curriculum development from kindergarten through the twelfth grade, and placed an emphasis on the implementation of the graduation requirements. A panel discussion which included personnel from the Department of Education went over the graduation requirements with conference participants, and educators from the Department and from OCE provided assistance to districts working to meet the July 1 deadline for filing an implementation plan. Representatives of secondary schools commented on a follow-up questionnaire that they need further assistance in:

- Determining what our minimum survival competencies will be.
- Making our total staff aware of the graduation requirements.
- Coordinating secondary (education) with elementary (education).
- Record keeping.

Many other comments were received, but problems with record keeping were the most prevalent in the questionnaire. (Small Schools Program, 1974)

IN-HOUSE WORKSHOPS. One of the proposals of the short range task force was to hold an in-house workshop to update Department of Education personnel; this was completed in June, 1974. Sixty staff persons attended the workshops, at which time specific aspects of the graduation requirements were spelled out. Record keeping procedures, district implementation plans, planned course statements, minimum competencies, performance indicators, and other facets of the requirements were explained. Upon completion of the workshops, staff members had the capability to assist in the continuing task of disseminating information to school districts.

TELEVISION SHOWS. Five television shows were presented in mid-August, 1974, for the benefit of teachers and members of the general public who had not been thoroughly exposed to the high school graduation requirements. The shows were presented through the Public Broadcasting Service, television stations KOAP and KOAC during the weeks of August 19-23 and August 26-30. Each of the five shows was one-half hour in length.

The first program presented an overview of the state's educational goals and how they relate to the graduation requirements, as well as the many aspects of the new requirements. The second program took an in-depth look at the survival competencies in the new requirements and the theory behind them. The technical aspects of implementing the new requirements at the teacher level were considered. The third show dealt with planned course statements, the fourth show looked at teaching activities and learning evaluation under the new requirements, and the final program discussed the procedures involved in record keeping.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM. Much work has been done on the implementation of the graduation requirements. Nevertheless, mistakes have been made in the implementation program used by the Department which along with the graduation requirements, has been criticized by some school districts. A frequent comment of school districts is that they were not given enough time to do an adequate job of developing and implementing all of the programs included in the new requirements. Other district comments include: *The terminology used in the graduation requirements was confusing, and was compounded by unclear terminology in the pilot project guidelines; a lack of communication was evident at times when dealing with the Department of Education, and some members of the department were not fully prepared to answer questions when sent out to explain*

the requirements to the districts; and the work of the Tri-county Graduation Requirements Project in preparing the guidelines on "Planned Course Statements" and "Record Keeping," available in June, 1974, was too late to be of any immediate assistance in some districts.

The fact that the graduation requirements constitute an all-new educational approach, one that has not been tried on such a large scale anywhere else in the United States, means that many of the answers had to be discovered along the way. Certainly all of the questions about the new graduation requirements cannot yet be answered, nor will they be for many years. What is significant is that district criticisms are usually against the implementation process, while the overall educational philosophy included in the requirements usually is viewed favorably. Accountability education has been criticized by some influential educators, however, and their comments will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

The rationale behind the speedy implementation program was explained by Dr. Parnell at the September, 1972, hearing when the requirements were adopted. The public, he said, "won't hold still much longer" about the way the schools now operate.

• • • • •

VII. RESPONSE TO GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS[11]

Although some of the state's schools were experimenting with curricular innovations even before the state developed new school graduation requirements

11 *The work of the Albany School District is outlined in Appendix B.*

(page 14), most districts did not deal with the issue until the graduation requirements were being considered or were already adopted. The efforts of the Sheridan, Eugene, and Cascade Union High School districts will be looked at here, as will the seven districts in Jackson County who worked together as a unit to meet the requirements. These districts serve as examples of the state's districts who have been the most successful in developing programs in line with the new graduation requirements.

SHERIDAN SCHOOL DISTRICT. One of the first small districts to take the initiative in meeting the new requirements was the Sheridan district. With the assistance of students and staff from the Oregon College of Education, Sheridan was able to involve its entire school staff, from kindergarten through the twelfth grade, in the development of competency statements and performance indicators. The work done in the Sheridan district has become a model for districts throughout Yamhill County and the state.

Sheridan's "Steering Committee on Graduation Requirements" began its work in August, 1973 -- one month ahead of the timeline suggested in the pilot project guidelines. Throughout the implementation process, Sheridan was able to stay ahead of the suggested timeline.

In January, 1974, Sheridan staff members and OCE students and staff began to develop minimum competency statements and performance indicators for the district. This task was completed in April, and the materials were distributed to teachers in the district one month later.

One of the strong points in Sheridan's implementation process was that all of the teachers in the district became involved in writing course goals, performance

indicators and competency statements. This total involvement resulted in a stronger base for acceptance of the new graduation requirements than if the work had been done in committees and handed down to teachers to implement in the classroom. Sheridan's experience shows that there will be acceptance of the requirements if they are understood by teachers.

One major innovation which came out of Sheridan's efforts was a checklist which included all of the minimum competencies the district hoped to instill in their students in twelve years of schooling. When students are able to perform one of these minimum competencies, they are given credit on the checklist, and do not need to be concerned about future testing on that particular survival skill.

CASCADE UNION HIGH SCHOOL. Cascade Union High School in Turner is faced with some special problems because of the structure of a union high school district. The high school serves six independent grade school districts, and there have been some problems in involving all of the districts in the implementation of the graduation requirements. Although the participation of primary schools is not required thus far, administrators in both the Cascade and Sheridan districts see such involvement as crucial to a successful program.

The Cascade district was able to keep up with the suggested timeline, and at least 60 persons, a large percentage of the staff, were involved in developing the minimum competencies and performance indicators. The district estimates that the cost of implementing the requirements, not including release time for teachers, has been $4,500 thus far. The district had the advantage of having been involved in a state pilot project in the area of personal finance education five years ago, and was able to draw upon that experience in meeting this aspect

of the requirements. Also, although not required to do so, the district has developed a philosophy and a set of goals to be followed in developing new programs.

EUGENE DISTRICT 4J. The Eugene school district was actively involved in an evaluation of high school graduation requirements even before the Board of Education approved the new state requirements. In January, 1972 -- the same month that the second draft of the state's requirements was completed -- a committee of faculty and students from Eugene's four high schools was appointed by the district superintendent to study high school graduation requirements. The impetus for the formation of the committee was a request by Dr. Parnell for Eugene to assist the state by developing an alternative proposal for new school graduation requirements.

The committee was active for eight months, and it developed some graduation requirement proposals different from those finally adopted by the state. However, Eugene did not abandon the committee's work, and the district now plans on implementing a unique educational system in the high schools, if approval can be obtained from the State Department of Education.

The Eugene district's proposal is to develop three alternative programs from which students may choose to obtain their high school education. A description of the three approaches states:

> *(There) are three alternative approaches to program development: (1) The traditional approach, which produces a program of studies based on a similar rationale to that used in most school districts; (2) The interdisciplinary approach, which places emphasis on designing a program of studies around five life roles man plays during his lifetime (including man as a problem solver, man and leisure, man as a community member, man as a worker and consumer, and man as a physical being); (3) The highly personalized approach, the success of which is determined by the level and accuracy of input by the*

three conferring parties. The three requirements for graduation outlined in plan three are: A required minimum number of units, a required number of semesters of attendance, and the satisfactory completion of a planned course of study. (Worrell, 1972)

The curriculum in the third approach would be developed by the mutual agreement of the student, the student's parents, and the school administration.

Since a portion of this proposal does not comply with the new graduation requirements, the Eugene district plans to ask the Board of Education for approval of the program on an experimental basis.

The development of programs to meet community needs is a process which is encouraged under the new graduation requirements. Eugene and other cities have taken the new graduation requirements as a starting point in the development of curriculum designed to fit the needs of their area.

JACKSON COUNTY. One year after the graduation requirements had been approved by the Board of Education, seven school districts in Jackson County began working as a team to meet the graduation requirements. The districts hired a consultant to assist them in developing minimum survival competencies and performance indicators and in meeting the rest of the requirements. Their work was completed in June, 1974, and is currently being distributed throughout the state as a model project.

In the Jackson County project, community members and faculty were involved in the developmental stages. Community involvement began on a large scale in March, 1974, when community workshops were held to determine the primary goals of education in the county. The community's top priority concerns were that students should: (1) Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening;

(2) Gain a general education; (3) Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth. These goals were used to evaluate the work that had already been done and to provide guidance in future work.

In the seven school districts involved in the project a permanent record of the student's performance, including achievement of survival level competencies, will be kept throughout the twelve years of schooling. When the student achieves a minimum survival competency, it will be marked on the student's permanent record.

• • • • •

VIII. THE FUTURE FOR OREGON EDUCATION

The Oregon school graduation requirements were not developed in a static educational environment. One of the recent actions by the State Board of Education was to approve six new "Goals for Oregon Learners," goals which will influence curriculum development at all grade levels. Also, the Board is expected to approve the new "Minimum Standards for Oregon Schools" before the end of 1974, and these standards will incorporate the high school graduation requirements within them. The Board is soon expected to adopt a statewide planning and evaluation system and has already adopted a policy statement and implementation plan for competency-based personnel development. These and other policy statements have led the Department of Education to declare that the Board is in the process of a "major policy shift." That shift, the Department believes, is:

FROM

- Traditional college-bound and academic-based programs
- Textbook-centered curricular programs
- Academic-based teacher training programs
- Teaching-based programs

TO

- Learner-based programs
- Performance-based programs
- Competency-based programs
- Experience-based programs
- Community-based programs

The new school graduation requirements, then, represent only a portion of the overall shift in educational policy. The actions taken by the Board of Education which will have the most effect on the graduation requirements are the new educational goals and the minimum standards for schools.

GOALS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION. Six goals for Oregon students in elementary and secondary schools were approved by the Board of Education in February, 1974, after input had been received from thousands of citizens at statewide conferences. Goals proposed by the Department of Education were reviewed by Goals Advisory Councils which were convened at the state's 13 community colleges in late 1973, and the opinions of these groups and other members of the public were reflected in the six goals which were adopted.

The aim of the goals was to answer two fundamental questions: (1) What competencies does a person need to cope with modern society? and (2) What responsibilities do schools have in helping individuals develop these competencies?

The goals replaced the lengthy "Philosophy of Education for Oregon Schools" adopted by the Board in 1959.

The new educational goals are --

- In preparation for the role of learner:

  Each individual will develop the basic skills of reading, writing, computation, spelling, speaking, listening, and problem solving; and he will develop a positive attitude toward learning as a lifelong endeavor.

- In preparation for the role of individual:

  Each learner will develop the skills to achieve fulfillment as a self-directed person; acquire the knowledge to achieve and maintain physical and mental health; and develop the capacity to cope with change through an understanding of the arts, humanities, scientific processes, and the principles involved in making moral and ethical choices.

- In preparation for the role of producer:

  Each individual will learn of the variety of occupations; will learn to appreciate the dignity and value of work and the mutual responsibilities of employers and employees; and will learn to identify personal talents and interests, make appropriate career choices, and develop career skills.

- In preparation for the role of citizen:

  Each individual will learn to act in a responsible manner; will learn of the rights and responsibilities of citizens of the community, state, nation, and world; and will learn to understand, respect, and interact with other cultures, generations, and races.

- In preparation for the role of consumer:

  Each individual will acquire knowledge and develop skills in the management of personal resources to provide wisely for personal and family needs and to meet obligations to self, family, and society.

- In preparation for the role of family member:

  Each individual will learn of the rights and responsibilities of family members, and acquire the skills and knowledge to strengthen and enjoy family life.

These learner goals will be subject to review periodically to determine if they meet the needs of the current situation. All board action in the future will contribute to meeting these goals.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR OREGON SCHOOLS. Revisions to the state's minimum standards for schools have been under consideration for several years, and the Board of Education is nearing a decision on the revisions. All indications point to a decision on the revisions before the end of 1974.

The proposed standards currently being considered by the Board incorporate some policies which have already been adopted, such as the Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education and the graduation requirements, with many new standards and ideas. The proposed standards state that, for purposes of planning and evaluation, each district would be required to do the following:

Develop Instructional Goals --

- *District-level goals expressing broad statements of student outcomes desired by the local community and by the state as evidenced by the Oregon Board of Education Goals for Elementary and Secondary Education.*
- *Program-level goals describing expected student outcomes for all instructional program areas offered by the district in grades K-12.*
- *Course goals describing expected student outcomes for all courses or other units of study in grades 9 through 12 designated by the district as fulfilling Minimum State Requirements for Graduation.*
- *A method of planning which relates classroom instruction to the district's program goals.*

Develop Instructional Assessment --

- *Each school district shall assess student outcomes in relationship to the above instructional goals.*

Identify Needs --

Each school district shall have adopted and implemented:

- *Procedures for identifying discrepancies between expected student outcomes and actual student outcomes.*
- *Procedures for using this information in program planning.*

Another new aspect of the minimum standards is expected to increase the

individualization of the instruction. The section on "Diagnosis and Prescription" states as follows:

Each School District Shall Have --

- *Adopted and implemented diagnostic procedures in basic skills which assure identification of individual learning strengths, learning problems, interests, and potentials.*

- *Adopted and implemented plans and procedures which will facilitate meeting the instructional needs of individual students by providing learning activities to deal with individual learning strengths, learning problems, interests and special problems associated with handicaps.*

The minimum standards revisions now being considered would also expand other aspects of the educational program encompassed by the school graduation requirements. The requirement for the development of minimum survival level competencies is already implicitly a part of the primary school curriculum, and the proposed minimum standards state:

> *Instruction in grades K (kindergarten) through 8 shall provide students with the opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills in personal development, social responsibility and career development applicable to the minimum competencies adopted by the appropriate high schools.*

The suggested minimum standards also state that instruction in grades kindergarten through 8 shall include communications skills, mathematics, science, social science, health education, physical education, music education, and the performing arts. These categories are a departure from the traditional structure of the primary school curriculum.

The basic thrust of the new minimum standards would be to incorporate primary and secondary programs into a cohesive unit wherever possible, in order to develop a smooth-flowing educational program for the student.

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL GOAL-SETTING PROGRAM. A grant of $116,057 was provided to the Oregon Board of Education on February 8, 1974, to be used by several school districts in the state to develop improved ways to involve their communities in goal-setting for education. The grant was disseminated to two types of districts: (1) Those who wished to develop improved strategies for involving communities in educational goal setting, and (2) Those who wish to document improved methods for community involvement in goal setting which have already been tried and tested by the district.

The grant was requested from the Weyerhaeuser Foundation by the Department of Education because of the need to develop models for goal setting, which is a key aspect of the proposed minimum standards. In the Request for Proposals sent to all of the state's elementary and secondary school districts in April informing them of the grant availability, the reasons for establishing educational goals were stated:

> *The interest in helping local districts develop effective educational goals is based on the assumption that the process of goal-setting, if done properly, can significantly help to achieve consensus among the many different audiences impacting on schools. The need to achieve agreement among these audiences on what the schools can realistically be expected to do can be illustrated by two points stated below.*
>
> *It is important that the chosen outcomes for education, as expressed by goals, have a close relationship to the type of educational program voters are willing to finance. This lack of consensus may have contributed to the fact that during the last four years, between 23.4% and 31.75% of all Oregon school budgets have been turned down at the first vote.*
>
> *All elements in the district -- students, taxpayers, community organizations, businessmen, and so forth -- should have active and extensive participation in goal-setting so there is a general consensus on "what" education should attempt to achieve. Once this is established, educational personnel have clearer signals for selecting the appropriate "how's" (i.e., the specific methods of instruction) to carry out these expectations. The direct involvement of school*

and community in goal-setting is even more important as districts plan their minimum Graduation Requirements. (State Department of Education, 1974)

The five districts chosen for the Goal-Setting Program ar[illegible]eynolds, Jefferson County, Beaverton, Portland (Area 2), and Neah-Kah-[illegible]e districts. The Reynolds and Jefferson County schools have already begun involving citizens in decision-making, and will use the funds to document their citizen participation programs.

In the Reynolds district, current attitudes of citizens toward the long-range goals of schools were tested by sending a sample of 20 preliminary goal statements to 6,000 families. The responses were used to prioritize and modify the first list, and to add new goals. Mailings and revisions were continued until an adequate set of goals emerged.

A "Warm Springs Social Studies Curriculum Project" was developed in Jefferson County because of a concern for the erosion of cultural identity in the Warm Springs Indian Community. An ad hoc community group developed 14 social studies lessons to be used in the fifth grade.

The Beaverton district is planning to conduct a poll to assess attitudes of area residents toward their schools. Also, three different community involvement processes will be tested.

In Area 2 of the Portland district, new testing methods to increase community involvement in goal-setting will be tried in a relatively low income area. As many as 75 citizens will be trained in goal-setting methods in a workshop to be held in the winter of 1974.

The Neah-Kah-Nie Project is an attempt to overcome the parochial interests of the six school districts serving one high school district. A "communication-information model" will be tested to establish community goals for the high school.

The work of the five districts will be published at the completion of the 18-month project, and will be available to other districts by September 1, 1975.

• • • • •

IX. DISTRICT AND SDE NEEDS UNDER THE NEW EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

As educators shift gears to meet new requirements, they will undoubtedly discover new personnel and administrative needs which must be met before the new requirements can achieve their fullest impact. One of the main areas of concern in the future will be the development of the skills needed by administrators in the future to accommodate changes in education.

ADMINISTRATORS' SKILLS. The implementation process used in the new graduation requirements has shown the need for certain skills in administrators which were not as vital in the past. Foremost among these is the need for administrators to acquire the skills necessary to develop a cohesive team of educators, students, and the general public. In the future, teamwork between all segments of the population will be as crucial as having a strong decision-making individual at the helm of the school. While the leadership qualities will still be vital in administrators, that leadership will need to be directed toward organization and integration of all segments of the community rather than independent decision-making.

Much of the responsibility for developing administrators with the needed skills rests with the state's colleges and universities which train administrators for school positions.

The Small Schools Program is currently developing guidelines on what skills administrators in small school districts will need in the future, and the program intends to work on assisting administrators in developing these skills.

CONTINUOUS REVIEW PROCESS. In order for the high school graduation requirements and other new educational programs to be effective, there must be continuous review at the state and district levels. The old graduation requirements were frequently criticized as being "outdated," and, of course, the new requirements will meet the same fate if they are not looked at regularly to see if they are in line with the changing times.

The Board did not mandate that it must review the requirements at certain time intervals, although it is expected to do so. Local districts are expected to assess their elective course offerings regularly, and most will do so at least every four years. The planned course statements, minimum competencies, and performance indicators will probably also be reviewed frequently, as teachers and districts strive to maintain relevance in the classroom.

It is conceivable that the State Department of Education could provide lists of minimum competencies and other developments of local districts to other districts throughout the state as the graduation requirements become a part of the curriculum. With such data, school districts could assess their efforts against those of other communities, and pick up some new ideas while discarding ineffective guidelines and statements. Although the SDE has not developed a

program of this nature, a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon evaluated the minimum competency statements of four school districts to determine their similarities and dissimilarities. (Appendix C) This kind of data could be compiled and distributed by the State Department of Education, or could be used by the State Board of Education to develop a pool of survival skills common to all districts which could be mandated statewide. No serious consideration has been given to such an idea, and districts need not be concerned about immediate state actions in these areas.

• • • • •

X. THE MOVE TOWARD ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION

Finally, the long-range effects of Oregon's new educational program must be considered. The state has made a firm commitment to accountability education and embarked on a program unlike any ever adopted in any other state. For this reason, predictions of the effect of the educational system on students, educators, or society at large must be based largely on speculation.

PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING. While much has been written which praises the movement towards greater accountability in the schools, some educators are questioning this approach. In some parts of the country, accountability is synonymous with "performance contracting" -- a technique in which school districts contract with private companies for the development of an educational program. If the educational goals specified in the contract are not met by the students, the contracting company simply is not paid for its work.

While this system has generated little interest in Oregon, it has been tested in several U.S. cities and remains popular in some circles despite much criticism. The authors of an anthology on performance contracting believe that, at the least, the concept will not easily die, and may possibly revolutionize education:

> *Performance contracting has as its kernel a powerful idea: Someone other than children must bear the responsibility for whether children learn successfully. Who bears that responsibility and to what measure, are questions loaded with dynamite. Surround these questions with money, risk, publicity, new teaching strategies, new people, new rhetoric, systems analysis, contingency management, and more, and it is no wonder that this recent, and thus far miniscule, phenomenon has raised such a ruckus in public education. (Meckleburger and Wilson, 1972)*

Some people argue bitterly against the concept. One author states in response to the argument of an advocate of performance contracting that, "It's not so much input that counts as output":

> *This is a rather remarkable but succinct distillation of the arguments in favor of performance contracts as a solution to school problems. Implicit in it are a number of assumptions. (a) The end justifies the means. Means are not to be considered except in terms of evidence that they do indeed work. Validity, soundness of basic premises, theoretical assumptions, consistency with research, are all to be left to the contractor. (b) Any unplanned, incidental effects on learners are not of importance. As long as the ends are spelled out as behavioral goals and the contractor promises to achieve those goals; never mind the bed-wetting, self-esteem, anti-social acts, or effects on other areas of learning. Such concerns are "fuzzy-minded." (c) Besides, it's easier to stipulate end products than a program to achieve them. (d) Educators have no input worth considering (other than choosing whose promises to believe) and teachers in particular, by virtue of past failures, have forfeited the right to make educational decisions. They are to become efficient technicians, trained just enough to carry through the contractor's program but not enough to interfere with it. In fact, a pep rally might be better than in-service training since the main thing is that teachers have faith and enthusiasm in the program. (Goodman, 1972).*

PROS AND CONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY. With some changes in wording and emphasis, many of these arguments can, and have been, leveled against accountability education in general. They would be valid arguments in a poorly developed, highly directive accountability system. One of the strong assets of the Oregon Graduation Requirements, however, is that they are not composed of a lengthy list of tasks which turn teachers into automatons; rather, they are flexible, and most importantly, the teachers and school districts themselves are responsible for developing the program and deciding what the student must learn. Under the Oregon system, the state's concern is with learner outcome, while districts deal with the issue of how to achieve that outcome.

Much can be learned from the critics of educational accountability, however, and their views should not be discounted. In a comprehensive review of educational accountability, educational writer Arthur Combs has criticized most aspects of the educational approach. His criticisms of the behavioral objectives (or minimum survival level competencies) approach to accountability, include:

> *A behavioral objectives approach is essentially a symptomatic approach to behavior change. The behavior of an individual at any moment, it must be understood, is not a cause; it is result ... Concentrating attention, therefore, on behavior is to to deal with it "after the fact," at the end of the process rather than its origin...*
>
> *The behavioral objectives approach is a closed system of thinking. It demands that ends be defined in advance. This tends to place a straitjacket on teachers and students alike and makes the learning situation a search for "right" answers...*
>
> *While behavioral objectives are useful in the achievement of specific skills, they do not lend themselves well to more general objectives. To achieve the precision desired for effective use, behavioral objectives must customarily be defined with greater and greater specificity .. By concentrating attention on specific rather than general goals of the educational process, the major thrust of the entire system tends to be distorted as minor, rather than major, goals take precedence in the classroom...*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One of the saddest aspects of the current press for behavioral objectives is the contributions it makes to the further demoralization of teachers. Citizens these days are demanding change in education and well they might. Such change is long overdue. Unhappily, pressures can also destroy morale ... A characteristic response to too many demands is to close them out of consciousness and confine one's self to only those details he can do mechanically without the necessity for thought.

On the opposite continuum of the accountability furor, a Minnesota teacher tells of the values of preparing instructional objectives in a Language Arts Course:

First, expressing the instructional objectives of the curriculum compels us to identify the parameters of the discipline. Whether we are trying to hammer out a cognitive or an affective objective, we must answer the implicit question: Is this truly our concern? Do we want it to be? Is it appropriate? Significant? More readily achieved through the English curriculum than some other?

Second, writing instructional objectives compels us to identify our intentions for the discipline vis-a-vis these students.

Third, by writing objectives we are forced to question the conventional or traditional content of Language Arts. For once, we are starting where we should begin: with our intentions rather than a bag full of content. Why do we use certain pieces of literature? Certain paraphernalia that happens to be around? Are these things that best help us get from here to there?

Fourth, we are required to decide how we will know when we have achieved or appear to be on the way to measuring our goals. If we specify measurement criteria, we must have some notion how we will apply them and whether or not they are applicable and relevant.

Fifth, expressing our own objectives keeps the identification of our goals where they belong -- in the charge of the professional English teacher.

And finally, by setting our own goals we are participating in the reshaping of our discipline as it moves from education as teaching to education as learning.

The teacher goes on to mention some of the possible abuses of behavioral objectives, such as:

The first, and most likely abuse or misuse in building a curriculum for Language Arts on behavioral objectives is that of limiting our range to those relatively minor concerns that are precisely quantifiable.

"Given two sentences, each of which contains one misspelled work, 80% of the 6th grade students will identify 60% of the misspelled words."

Another abuse of the objective tool is that of relating our objectives to the wrong kinds of measurements -- norm-referenced rather than criterion-referenced tests.

And finally, by stubbornly insisting that behavioral objectives are inappropriate for Language Arts, we are abdicating our own professional responsibility for setting our own educational goals. (Nachbar, 1974)

Finally, on the subject of accountability, one author has compiled a list of strong and weak aspects of educational accountability. The list is reprinted here.

ADVANTAGES OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY.

1. Side effects of accountability programs have been positive; students respond well to the added interest in their learning and welfare. Teachers seek more effective teaching techniques and show greater concern for slow learners and culturally deprived students.

2. Performance contracting facilitates the targeting and evaluation of educational programs, introduces more resources and greater variability to the public school sector, allows a school system to experiement in a responsible manner with low costs, plays a significant role in school desegregation, and creates dynamic tension and responsible institutional changes within the school system through competition.

3. The teaching role will change from information giving to directing learning.

4. Schools' facilities will become more open, more flexible, and less group-oriented. Students can learn as individuals or as members of a group.

5. The curriculum will become more relevant as the whole environment becomes a source for schooling.

6. Outmoded myths and an incomplete educational tradition can be exposed and perhaps eliminated from the schools.

7. Accountability measures can identify effective schools.

8. Accountability measures may help to improve both staff utilization and selection of new personnel by using information on teacher effectiveness in different spheres and with different types of students.

9. Accountability measures can be used to establish a connection between personnel compensation and performance.

10. School accountability measures could provide guidance to district administrators in allocating resources and differentially among schools according to educational need.

11. Accountability puts the emphasis on the processes of teaching and learning by considering what individual children already know, what they need to learn, how best they can learn, and how their progress can be measured.

12. Accountability will provide for the growth and adoption of real standards -- criterion-referenced and performance standards -- instead of relative positioning on vaguely known validation groups.

13. Collective-type bargaining will become more balanced as both sides develop proof of results.

14. Accountability will force the changes in teacher education and training so long demanded by those within and outside the profession.

15. Educators will scramble to develop a technology of instruction -- to find and use "what works."

DISADVANTAGES OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY.

1. The most important outcomes of education are human and humane and will not yield to an accountability scheme.

2. Premature marriage between education and existing accountability mechanisms may tie the education enterprise to the pursuit of inconsequential ends.

3. Accountability and performance contracting empasizes the conserving rather than the changing functions of education.

4. Developing accountability systems will be expensive in terms of needed research, development, diffusion, and installation costs. Further costs will accrue from the necessary major revamping of teacher education.

5. The legal deterrents stem from uncertainty: major issues stemming from accountability experiments have not been tested in the courts.

6. A void exists between the demands of accountability and the present stock of standardized instruments. The major problems involve questionable test validity, poor overlap between program and test objectives, inappropriate test instructions and directions, and confusing test designs and formats.

7. Through the misapplication of the accountability processes, the schools can become political tools in the hands of dissenting groups and the needs of students can become subordinate to political issues.

8. Compromises are often made on short-range objectives, with the result that accountability stresses those objectives on which people can agree, like decoding skills in reading or basic arithmetic skills.

9. The use of most nationally normed standardized tests to assess a given teacher's performance would be analogous to using a bathroom scale to determine how many stamps to put on a letter.

10. The criteria for evaluation are likely to be selected or designed by staff external to the school.

11. Accountability testing would overemphasize lower level objectives and underrepresent higher level ones. The consequence, then, would be that teachers who stress lower level objectives would do well by the accountability criteria while teachers who facilitate the growth of higher level objectives would appear to be less satisfactory teachers.

12. To assess a teacher's professional skill by testing students to ascertain what they may or may not have learned completely divorces a teacher's performance from the constraints of the educational system within which he is obliged to operate.

13. State legislation on teacher evaluation can be a red herring drawn across the train of such ulterior motives as power plays, tax manipulation, and the wooing of big business.

14. Most accountability programs have been installed in organizational settings that lack the necessary background and organizational traditions to assimilate them. Insufficient emphasis has been placed on the development of an organizational philosphy and on the determination of accountability policies before the implementation of the program.

15. Accountability systems have been designed by specialists, approved at the highest levels, and imposed without explanation on those who have to implement them. This occurs because the problem is approached from an organizational rather than an individual perspective. (Nickel, 1974)

It will be left for the reader to decide the validity of these arguments and how applicable they are to the system established in Oregon. Some of the arguments will not be settled until a system of education is underway which includes behavioral objectives, whether they be minimum survival competencies as in Oregon, or some other form of objectives. Since Oregon will pioneer a large-scale

program of accountability education, it lends itself to this type of future assessment and evaluation.

ASSESSMENT OF THE OREGON PROGRAM OF EDUCATION. There are a number of approaches available to the researcher wishing to test the effectiveness of Oregon's new school graduation requirements and other educational programs. First, the researcher must decide what question he hopes to answer through his research. A valid question would be:

> *Have the new school graduation requirements resulted in a significant change in educational attainment?*

The researcher could hypothesize that there has been a significant increase in the ability of students to accomplish certain specified and definable tasks, which can be measured by performance indicators, while at the same time the academic achievement of the students has not been reduced. This was the intent of the new requirements.

Along the same lines, the researcher could establish as a research question:

> *Does the attainment of the required minimum survival level competencies by students lead to the development of a process of problem solving on the part of students?*

This question would be aimed at determining whether the state's graduation requirements instill in students the ability to become lifelong learners. Although the graduation requirements call for the development of lifelong learner skills in students, it cannot be known immediately how effective the efforts at developing these skills will be.

The hypothesis on this issue is difficult to speculate on, and it might read like this: The instilling of the lifelong learning capability within the

student varies from school to school and from teacher to teacher, and is dependent on issues such as curriculum development, the attitude of the teacher, and the aptitude of the student.

In both cases, the methods of gathering data would be basically the same. Two sample groups would be chosen, one from the population at large, and one from the population of students educated under the new Oregon system. The population at large could be composed of recent high school graduates in Oregon, the Oregon or national population as a whole, or a group similar in most controllable respects to the Oregon high school sample. An example of the third possibility would be high school students in Washington, assuming that scholastic achievement is the same in that state as in Oregon, or at least could be taken into consideration, and that other characteristics of the Washington state population could be determined and isolated so as not to influence the results of the research.

These more technical aspects of research will be left to the researcher.

When the state's competency-based education program has been in effect for several years, the possibilities will open up for much more research. For instance, how effective were the career education programs and minimum survival competencies in preparing students for vocational roles? Have students developed into lifelong learners more than students have done in the past?

The possibility will soon exist to test all of the assumptions on which Oregon's new school graduation requirements are based. The results should have a profound effect on educational philosophy throughout the nation.

CONCLUSIONS

Numerous events which have taken place over a 96 year span have been reviewed in this paper. The only common thread which pulls these events together is that they all bear some relation to Oregon's school graduation requirements. It would be presumptious to say that all of the events relevant to the requirements adopted in 1972 are included in this document. The development of Career Education, which began even before the new graduation requirements were in the planning stage, is an example of an event relevant to the graduation requirements which was not included in this document. I am aware of other examples, and undoubtedly there are others of which I am not aware.

It is difficult to conclude from my work that the new requirements are either good or bad, since such an opinion would be based strictly on subjective information. However, it is a fact that the new requirements have forced educators to think about their programs and teaching techniques, and that can only be regarded as a step in the right direction. Whether the graduation requirements will actually affect student performance and make the state's schools more exciting places to be, are questions which will be answered by time.

I can conclude simply that the State of Oregon has taken the initiative in testing a program on which countless essays have been written, and whether it is a success or failure, the state's citizens may take credit for putting a new idea into action rather than merely on paper.

Some concerns were expressed to me by teachers and administrators that the departure of Dr. Dale Parnell from his position as Superintendent of Public Instruction in March, 1974, might result in a withdrawal of support for the

new graduation requirements at the state level. From my perspective as an intern at the Department of Education, however, I have found that the new Superintendent, Jesse Fasold, is fully committed to maintaining the new requirements. Regardless of the Superintendent's opinion, however, the fact is that policies are established by the State Board of Education, and the Board reaffirmed its support of the requirements soon after Dr. Parnell's departure.

Therefore districts can expect continued support for the educational concepts incorporated in the requirements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much of the credit for this report goes to the many people within the Department of Education and outside of it. My sincere thanks are extended to Bob Clemmer, Don Egge, Dave Curry, Bus Nance, Don Miller, Herb Nicholson, Ray Osburn, Jim Impara, Jack Allen, Marguerite Wright, Sharon Case, Clover Stein, Cynthia Longley, Johanna Ruggles, and Marilyn Bauer at the Department of Education.

Among the many people outside of the department who have been vital to the development of this report are Kenneth Bierly, University of Oregon; Bill Worrell, Eugene School District; Skip Mason, Oregon College of Education; Fern Eberhart, Sheridan School District; Bob Green, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory; Vic Doherty, the Portland School District; Earl Anderson, Multnomah County IED: Lynn Frederico, Cascade Union High School; John Herbert, Walter Junior High School in Salem; Jack Knapp of the Albany Union High School District; and many others who have given me ideas and information.

I am grateful to all of these people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bierly, Kenneth; *A Content Analysis of Competency Statements Contained in Requirements for School Graduation in Selected Innovative Public School Districts in Oregon*; Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon; 1974.

Combs, Arthur; *Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives*; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; 1972.

Doherty, Victor, and Hathaway, Walter; *Introduction to Course Goals for Educational Planning and Evaluation, K-12*; Tri-County Goals Development Project, Portland, Oregon; 1971.

Goodman, Kenneth S.; *Promises, Promises*; in Mecklenburger; Wilson and Hostrop; 1972.

Lawrence, Ben; *The Carnegie Unit: An Evaluation of its Utility for Secondary Education Achievement Evaluation*; Special Bulletin, Oregon School Study Council, School of Education, University of Oregon; 1965.

Mecklenburger, J. A., and Wilson, J. A.; *Learning C.O.D.: Can the Schools Buy Success?*; Introduction, Linnet Books; 1972.

Nachbar, Cornelia; *Accountability is Not a Dirty Word*; Elementary English; May, 1974.

National Education Association; *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, A Report of the Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education*; Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office; 1918.

Nickel, K. N.; *Accountability for What? For Whom?*; Elementary English; May, 1974.

Oregon Association of Secondary School Administrators; *Statement on Proposed Minimum State Requirements for Graduation*; September 21, 1972.

Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals; *Carnegie Unit Committee Report*; November 13, 1961.

Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals; *OASSP Compulsory Education and Graduation Requirements Committee Report*; April, 1970.

Oregon Board of Education; *Assessing Educational Need: First Step to Accountability*; State Department of Education, 1969.

_____; *Biennial Report -- 1931-32*; State Department of Education.

_____; *Goals for Oregon Learners*; Oregon Board of Education; 1974.

_____; *Learner Needs as Determined by Title III, ESEA*; Oregon Board of Education; October 19, 1969.

_____; *Memorandum to the State Department of Education Steering Committee on Graduation Requirements*; from Dave Curry; State Department of Education; May, 1973.

_____; *Minimum Standards for Public Schools*; Proposed Revisions; Oregon Board of Education; June 6, 1974.

_____; *Oregon Graduation Requirements: Administrative Guidelines, Personal Development Education, Social Responsibility Education, Career Development Education*; Graduation Requirements Task Force; State Department of Education; 1973. (Pilot Projects)

_____; *Oregon School Laws*; 1885-1941.

_____; *Report on Oregon Schools -- 1832-1960*; State Department of Education; 1960.

_____; *Rules for Governing the Standardizing and Accrediting of High Schools in the State of Oregon, 1913*; Oregon Board of Education; 1913.

_____; *Summer Leadership Camp, Opinionaire Results*; July, 1971.

Oregon Historical Society; *University of Oregon Admissions 1876-1927*; Oregon Historical Society Quarterly; June, 1929.

Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Education, *Report of the Legislative Interim Committee on Education, including Supplement*; October, 1972.

Parnell, Dale; Speech to high school administrators and teachers, Beaverton High School; Oregon Journal; August 28, 1968.

_____; Speech to the Portland City Club; Oregon Journal; September 21, 1968.

_____; Speech to school board members; Oregon Journal; December 18, 1969.

Schmeider, Allen A.; *Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene*; Washington, D.C.; National Education Association; 1973.

Small Schools Program; *Evaluation of the 1974 Small Schools Summer Institute*; June, 1974.

Stake, Robert; *School Accountability Laws*; Evaluation Comment; 1973.

Tompkins, Ellsworth, and Gaumintz, Walter; *The Carnegie Unit: Its Origin, Status, and Trends*; U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin, No. 7; Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office; 1964.

Works Progress Administration; *Oregon School History*; Oregon Writers and Historical Records Survey Project; 1938.

Worrell, William Kimsey; *High School Graduation Requirements as Perceived by Professional Staff, Parents, and Students of a Middle-Sized School District*; Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon; 1972.

Wright, Marguerite; *Oregonians Speak Out on Education*; A report on the Town Hall meetings conducted by the State Board of Education; 1970.

APPENDIX A

Senate Bill 2, considered by the 1971 Interim Legislative Committee on Education, contained many provisions, including the requirement that students achieve these competencies:

1/ The arts and humanities shall be used for enrichment of all basic subject areas to provide comprehensive understanding of their relationship to cultural heritage and development.

2/ Upon completion of the basic language arts and reading program, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Ability to read with speed and comprehension;

B/ Ability to write legibly, to express thoughts clearly and effectively in writing, to think analytically, to spell and punctuate accurately, to use appropriate grammar, and to employ an adequate vocabulary;

C/ Ability to speak effectively and to listen with comprehension; and

D/ Knowledge of and ability to use information sources.

3/ Upon completion of the basic mathematics program, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Ability to compute accurately and make practical use of mathematical skills;

B/ Ability to employ accurately the fundamental number skills: addition, subtraction, division and multiplication, including the use of fractions, decimals, and percentages;

C/ Ability to understand and use graphs, tables, charts, statistics, weights, and measures; and

D/ Ability to translate computation problems into mathematical terms.

4/ Upon completion of the basic science program, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Knowledge of elementary scientific assumptions, theories, principles, laws, and facts including an understanding of the impact of science and technology on human life; and

B/ Ability to employ the processes of scientific inquiry in systematic problem solving.

5/ Upon completion of the basic citizenship program, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Knowledge of personal, societal, governmental, and consumer economics with the ability to apply this knowledge in solving problems;

B/ Knowledge of individual rights and responsibilities necessary to a self-governing people; and

C/ Knowledge of local, state, and federal governments and their organization, functions, and services.

6/ Upon completion of the basic history program, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Knowledge of the history of Oregon, the United States, and world civilization; and

B/ Ability to interpret contemporary events in the perspective of historical developments.

7/ Upon completion of the basic program of studies in career opportunities, students will have demonstrated --

A/ Knowledge of the existence and value of many types of work;

B/ Knowledge of occupational fields, the requirements for entry, the skills and abilities needed and sources of training available; and

C/ Ability to identify the learning experiences and personal qualities needed to continue toward career goals.

8/ Upon the completion of the basic health and physical education program --

A/ Students will have demonstrated knowledge of the health, functions, structure, and nutritional needs of the human body; and

B/ Students will have participated in activities which contribute to strength, coordination, and agility.

Senate Bill 2 was not approved by the Oregon Legislature and it never became law.

APPENDIX B

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION IN ALBANY

The following pages deal with the efforts of Albany Union High School District 8J in meeting the state's graduation requirements, and how the district's efforts are related to actions taken by the State Department of Education. Although Albany's implementation procedures did not follow state-recommended guidelines, Albany was able to go beyond those guidelines to develop a program recognized by most educators as highly successful.

Since the work of the Albany district will be reviewed in greater detail than that of the four districts discussed in the main paper, it is included as supplemental material.

The timeline recommended by the State Department of Education for implementation of graduation requirements was not completed until May 1973, and not made generally available to school districts until September of that year. By September, however, Albany had already chosen a district coordinator for graduation requirements, and had their implementation plan approved by the School Board, while most districts in the state were just beginning to look at the graduation requirements.

In a chronological comparison of the actions of the Albany School District related to graduation requirements, State Department of Education assistance to districts in dealing with the requirements, and the timeline recommended by the six pilot projects, the Albany district's leadership is evident. This is illustrated in the chart on page 85a.

DATE	SDE	PILOT PROJECT	ALBANY
September 1972	Graduation requirements adopted by Oregon Board of Education.		
November 1972	Pilot projects chosen.		
December 1972			First discussion of graduation requirements by school board.
March 1973			Applications taken for district coordinator of graduation requirements.
April 1973			Jack Knapp chosen as district coordinator.
May 1973		Pilot project guidelines completed with the following recommended timeline:	
June 1973			Implementation network completed
August 1973		Project manager should be appointed.	Citizens' Advisory Group formation begins. Network adopted.
September 1973	Graduation requirements movie completed.	Steering committee* to be appointed.	First meeting of Citizens' Advisory Group, 10/2/73.
October 1973	One-day workshops held.		
February 1974			Graduation requirements reviewed by school board.
March 1974	Work begins on planned course statement record keeping guidelines.		
April 1974		Final adoption of competencies and performance indicators should take place.	
June 1974	Small Schools Summer Institute deals with grad. rqmts.		Tentative approval given to competencies.
August 1974			Final adoption of personal development & Goals Performance Indicators

* *A Steering Committee of persons to guide graduation requirement implementation was not developed in the Albany District. Several Advisory Committees were used instead.*

A Review of Albany's Actions --

The first discussion of the new graduation requirements by the Albany school district took place at the board's December 11, 1972, meeting. The minutes of that meeting state simply, "The Board discussed the new high school graduation requirements recently adopted by the state of Oregon under ORS 22-105 -- ORS 22-135. No action was taken."

After lengthy discussion of the graduation requirements at the meeting, the board directed the district's superintendent, Dr. Marvin Evans, to develop a plan for implemnting the requirements, which would be presented to the board at an unspecified date. Dr. Evans' response to that request was to issue a notice to teachers on March 1, 1974, that a new position of district coordinator for the new graduation requirements was being formed. The district coordinator's job, the notice said, would be part time, requiring one-half of the day during the school year of 1973-74 and possibly of 1974-75, and would require full time work in the summers of 1973, 1974, and possibly 1975.

The position of graduation requirements district coordinator was officially filled on April 23, 1973, when the school board appointed Jack Knapp, a social studies teacher at West Albany High School, to the post. Knapp was to begin work on the graduation requirements in June, 1973.

The board approval of a district coordinator for such a large block of time as the application suggested was one of the first direct indications of the board's willingness to develop the graduation requirements to the fullest possible extent, including using the requirements as a means of curriculum development.

Other board actions, indirectly related to the graduation requirements, took place between the December, 1972, meeting and the appointment of Knapp in

April, 1973, which led Knapp to later state "that the district accepted the challenge of the new graduation requirements project as a major undertaking which might last as long as five years." The board decisions Knapp is referring to deal primarily with the district's budget. During the summer of 1973, $7,400 was spent on the New Graduation Requirements Project, and in the summer months of 1974, $27,000 of the district's money was devoted to graduation requirements. This budgetary commitment far exceeds that of most of the state's school districts, many of whom have a district coordinator working only on a part time temporary basis.

After Knapp's appointment as district coordinator of the New Graduation Requirements Project, he was initiated to some of the duties of his new job in "Administrative Management Workshops" conducted by the Linn-Benton Intermediate Education District. One of the skills Knapp acquired at the workshops was that of "networking" -- developing an implementation system in which many different aspects of an overall plan work in harmony toward the ultimace goal of program implementation. A network for the Albany implementation program was developed in the summer of 1973, with Knapp working in harmony with Superintendent Evans and the district's Director of Instruction, Robert Stalick. One of the key elements of Albany's success with the graduation requirements was the ability of the three men to work together as a cohesive team, Knapp says.

The proposed network for implementation of the requirements was presented to the Albany School Board in August, 1973, and after some discussion, was approved by the board. Some of the major points in the district's timeline are listed on page

Staff time during the 1973-74 school year, and in the summer of 1974, will be used for the following tasks --

- To identify, with the assistance of the community, the survival level competencies for each of the major areas indicated under Personal Development, Social Responsibility, and Career Development, and to write these in goal statement form.
- To identify the courses in which these competencies will be taught.
- To write courses in a form prescribed by the Department of Education.
- To identify methods in which students can achieve these competencies.

Following the completion of these tasks, the network called for an assessment of student needs in the fall of 1974, in order to determine what elective areas should be offered in the ninth grade curriculum, followed by the writing of goals, the identification of courses, and the writing of courses for the ninth grade class.

The third major area of implementation was to be the development of information which the school board could use in deciding which of the available options, such as allowing off-campus credit, should be available in the district, as well as the problems associated with the implementation of the various options.

The network recognized community, student, and staff participation as major forces in meeting the New Graduation Requirements. In approving the formation of a Citizens Advisory Group in August, 1973, the school board stated that such a group would hopefully provide a sampling of public opinion in the following areas --

- What should be required of our students beyond the state minimums?

- What levels of competency are necessary for our students in each of the state and local required areas of study.
- What should be offered in our schools other than the required areas of study?
- What options should our district employ to facilitate the meeting of competencies and the earning of credit?

The school board believed that, in addition to the valuable advice the Citizens Advisory Committee would provide, the group would also later become a nucleus of citizens well informed of the graduation requirments, and would later be helpful in explaining the requirements to the general public.

The twelve months between August, 1973, and August, 1974, were used for the development of the ninth grade curriculum which would be in compliance with the New Graduation Requirements, and several presentations were made to the school board in that period. Some board members worked with citizens and other participants in the New Graduation Requirements Project in the spring and summer of 1973. The work completed to date by the Albany district includes --

- Program goals and competencies in the area of personal development.
- Program goals and enrichment goals in social science, health education, physical education, communication skills, reading, and science. Enrichment goals are used in the Albany district to define skills students should achieve beyond the minimum competencies.
- Program goals and enrichment goals for math, and planned course statements for competency math, general math, algebra, and geometry.
- A 350 item competency test for algebra and geometry students.
- Planned course statements for four semesters of geography electives for ninth graders.

- Planned course statements for all electives open to ninth grade students.

The Citizen's Advisory Committee, inactive for the summer, will resume its work this fall, developing program goals and other material for the tenth grade class, and developing more material for the ninth grade class. The network calls for the continuation of the New Graduation Requirements Project through the summer of 1975, although it is likely to extend for a longer period.

The Albany district's success can be attributed to a number of factors, some of which have already been mentioned. Central to the district's success was the establishment of a district coordinator position. This plus the district coordinator's training and utilization of networking techniques were most important to the effective implementation of the Albany project. Coordination at the district level, an enthusiastic superintendent and school board, and an active citizenry all contributed to Albany's success. In both the citizen and student advisory committees, care was taken to place people who were not in leadership positions on the committee. Citizens were asked to join the committee after they had been picked by an admittedly unscientific look at census data, which was used to break the community into various socio-economic groups. The intention was to have a representative of as many of these groups as possible. Students were asked to serve on the committee by their counselors, and students who were not class leaders were given top consideration.

One of the main tasks remaining for the Albany district is the development of a total curricular program from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. There are over twenty independent districts in the Union High School District, and little action has been taken to develop a program below the junior high school level. Once the minimum standards go into effect, however, the grade school districts and the Union High School District may begin work on a total program.

APPENDIX C*

TOTAL COMPETENCY STATEMENTS IN ALL AREAS AND SUB-AREAS
A CONTENT ANALYSIS
KEN BIERLY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

AREAS	SUB AREAS	ENUMERATION CATEGORIES									
		Congruous		Synonymous		Similar		Dissimilar		TOTAL	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	Communication	6	10	0	0	27	44	28	46	61	100
	Computation	17	17	6	7	35	36	39	40	97	100
	Science and Technology	16	16	6	6	17	16	59	62	98	100
	Health -- Mind and Body	0	0	0	0	25	29	61	71	86	100
	Lifelong Learner	4	7	0	0	15	28	35	65	54	100
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	Citizen of City, State, and Nation	0	0	0	0	32	34	61	66	93	100
	Citizen -- Environment	2	6	0	0	11	37	17	57	30	100
	Citizen -- Streets and Highways	0	0	0	0	4	40	6	60	10	100
	Consumer -- Goods and Services	0	0	0	0	26	40	38	60	64	100
CAREER DEVELOPMENT		4	7	2	3	15	27	35	63	56	100
TOTALS		49	7.5	14	2.1	207	31.9	379	58.5	649	100

* *Data derived from competency statements in the Beaverton, David Douglas, Eugene, and Portland school districts. Explanation: In the sub-area of communication, the four districts had written a total of 61 competency statements; twenty-eight of these, or 46 percent, were dissimilar, twenty-seven statements, or 44 percent, were similar, and so forth.*

* * * * *

This intern report was read and accepted by a staff member at:

Agency: Oregon State Department of Education

Address: 942 Lancaster Drive, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 973]0

This report was completed by a WICHE intern. This intern's project was part of the Resources Development Internship Program administered by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE).

The purpose of the internship program is to bring organizations involved in community and economic development, environmental problems and the humanities together with institutuions of higher education and their students in the West for the benefit of all.

For these organizations, the intern program provides the problem-solving talents of student manpower while making the resources of universities and colleges more available. For institutions of higher education, the program provides relevant field education for their students while building their capacity for problem-solving.

WICHE is an organization in the West uniquely suited for sponsoring such a program. It is an interstate agency formed by the thirteen western states for the specific purpose of relating the resources of higher education to the needs of western citizens. WICHE has been concerned with a broad range of community needs in the West for some time, insofar as they bear directly on the well-being of western peoples and the future of higher education in the West. WICHE feels that the internship program is one method for meeting its obligations within the thirteen western states. In its efforts to achieve these objectives, WICHE appreciates having received the generous support and assistance of the Economic Development Administration; the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation; the National Endowment for the Humanities; the National Science Foundation; the Division of Education of HEW; and of innumerable local leaders and community organizations, including the agency that sponsored this intern project.

For further information, write Bob Hullinghorst, Director, Resources Development Internship Program, WICHE, Drawer 'P', Boulder, Colorado 80302, (303) 443-6144.

3601-67214540000045600:
1.5C:1074:GD:WICHE:2H165